BX
801
E17

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

(MONTHLY)

VOL. III.] EDITED BY REV. H. J. HEUSER. [No. 3.

Professor of Exegesis and Introd. to S. Script., Theol. Seminary, Overbrook, Pa.

"*Ut Ecclesia ædificationem accipiat.*"
I. Cor. xiv. 5.

SEPTEMBER.

1890.

FR. PUSTET & CO.,

NEW YORK AND CINCINNATI.

SUBSCRIPTION, FOR THE UNITED STATES and CANADA, $3.50 per annum.

EUROPEAN COUNTRIES, $4.00. AUSTRALIA, $4.50

Literary Communications and Books for Review to be addressed to the Editor;
Business matters and Subscriptions, to the Publishers.

Entered at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., for transmission through the mails at Second-Class Rates.

Adprobatio.

Ephemerides Catholicas studio theologicarum disciplinarum promovendo, rebusque ecclesiasticis explicandis atque tuendis addictas, quæque hunc titulum præseferunt, AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, vehementer probamus cleroque commendamus.

J. CARD. GIBBONS,

Arch. Balt.

BALTIMORÆ,

die 22 *Junii*, 1889.

Imprimatur.

MICHAEL A. CORRIGAN,

Arch. Neo-Ebor.

NEO-EBORACI, *die m. Aug.* 25, 1890.

Imprimatur.

PATRITIVS JOANNES RYAN,

Archiep. Philadelph.

PHILADELPHIÆ, *die m. Jan.* 1, 1890.

H. GABRIELS, S. T. D.,

Censor Deputatus.

RECOMMENDATION.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA.
Washington, D. C., Nov. 2, 1889.

Messrs. FR. PUSTET & CO.

Gentlemen: By all means enroll me as subscriber to the REVIEW from its first number. So excellent a periodical deserves the hearty encouragement of all ecclesiastics.

Yours in Christ, JOHN J. KEANE.

AMERICAN

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. III.—SEPTEMBER, 1890.—NO. 3.

THE CHALICE.

THE legend of the Holy Grail, whatever may be its historic value, is certainly full of grave and beautiful lessons for the Christian priest. The mysterious chalice is made the first instrument by which Joseph of Arimathea is instructed in the liturgical service of the Mass. He who guards the sacred cup possesses the secret of eternal youth. Lancelot, daring unhallowed to approach it, is smitten to the ground by a blast of fire, whilst the noble Galahad, armed in spotless purity, derives from its presence the charm of unalloyed peace and a happy death. All this is but allegorical of the true sacred grail used hourly, the world over, since its natal day,[1] in order to perpetuate the eucharistic sacrifice of Holy Thursday. It is not known with certainty of what material the sacred cup was made which our divine Lord used at the last supper. Tradition says that it was crystal or glass. St. Bede mentions a silver cup with two handles preserved in the holy places at Jerusalem as the chalice of Our Lord.[2]

[1] Before the institution of the feast of Corpus Christi, in the thirteenth century, Holy Thursday was commonly called *Natalis Calicis*. "Vocatur hæc dies cœna Domini: vocatur et Natalis Calicis."—S. Elig. Hom. X. Cf. Catalani, Comment. Cær., Ep. I., 524; II., 338.

[2] In platea, quæ Martyrium et Golgotha continuat, exedra est, in qua calix Domini in scriniolo reconditus, per operculi foramen tangi solet et osculari. Qui argenteus calix duas hinc et inde habens ansulas, sextarii Gallici mensuram capit: in quo est et illa spongia Dominici potus ministra.—De loc sanct., cap. ii.

The relics of Christian antiquity and allusions of the early Fathers prove that the chalices used in the eucharistic sacrifice during the first centuries of the Church were sometimes of glass or other material less precious than gold, and that these had occasionally the form of a goblet or amphora with handles (calices ansati, or appensorii).[1] There can be no doubt, however, that even from the earliest times of the Christian Church, whenever the means of the faithful allowed it, reverence suggested the use of the most precious material for these unique vessels, which Optatus beautifully styles "Christi sanguinis portatores."

PRESENT DISCIPLINE AS TO FORM AND MATERIAL.

In course of time both form and material of the chalices used in the holy sacrifice were determined by a uniform discipline throughout the Church. The liturgy of the Mass being defined, the form of the chalice was suggested by the prescribed manner of its use. The rubrics speak of the cup (cuppa), the handle (nodus) and the foot (pes). There are different styles of chalices, the two principal ones of which are the Roman and the Gothic. Characteristic of the former are the perfectly circular lines in the shape of cup and foot, whilst the handle generally consists of a short stem, whose centre forms a round knob.

The Gothic chalice has a cup fashioned in form of a tulip; sometimes it is of oval shape, like the larger half of an egg. Its handle is longer than in the Roman chalice, with sharp corners, which are also introduced into the moulding of the knob and foot, having ordinarily six or eight sides. The so-called renascence in art brought forth new styles by a more or less graceful blending of the two mentioned. Looking

[1] There are various specimens of this kind preserved in the Vatican Museum. The paintings in the catacombs frequently represent the chalice in form of a glass goblet filled with red wine. Cf. De Rossi; Roma Sotteran., I., tabul. 8.—The *sacro catino* preserved in S. Lorenzo at Genoa, and another at Valencia, in Spain, can hardly lay claim to anything more than a pious belief that they date back to the early days of Christianity.

solely at the purpose for which the sacred vessel is intended, irrespective of elegance in style, that form recommends itself most in which the cup gradually widens towards the lip, not too much, however, and without ending in an abrupt edge. The latter defect is frequently found in Gothic chalices constructed after medieval patterns, and the large surface over which the contents are distributed when brought towards the rim, as the chalice is turned, present great danger of spilling. On the other hand, if the cup be rather narrow, as in many Roman chalices, it will be found on examining it after Mass, that some drops of the ablution still remain at the bottom, which have not been touched by the purificator. The knob (nodus) should be round and not too large, as the celebrant has to hold the chalice between the index and middle fingers, and the sharp corners of the Gothic patterns give pain when the chalice has to be lifted in that position. The stem, or that portion which connects the cup with the foot, should be uniformly strong. The delicate shaping above and below the knob, whilst it adds gracefulness to the form of the chalice, presents the danger of breaking the chalice at these points, especially when the stem is hollow. The manner of purifying usually throws an undue weight upon the cup, which makes a firm connection to the foot all the more necessary. Safety also demands that the foot of the chalice be broad and heavy, so as to avoid the possibility of easily overturning it. Whilst all becoming ornament, including monograms of a sacred character, are in place, St. Charles Borromeo, in his "Instructiones," forbids the use of family coats of arms and the like upon the sacred vessels. They may be placed at the bottom, but not upon the outer surface of the chalice. The same may be said of such inscriptions as have a personal character. Although there is no rubric requiring it, it is desirable to have a cross engraven or set upon the foot of the chalice, so as to mark the spot from which the sacred species is taken by the celebrant, in order that the ablution may be taken from the same part.

Formerly two small instruments accompanied the chalice as part of its furniture. The first was a narrow tube of gold or silver, through which the precious blood was absorbed. This was used in the early Church to communicate the people under both species. Afterwards the sacred ministers and the assisting bishop continued to make use of it. To-day the practice only survives in the communion of the Sovereign Pontiff, who receives the Precious Blood in this way from the chalice. The second instrument is a small gold or silver spoon, by means of which a few drops of water are taken from the cruet and mixed with the wine at the offertory. The reason of introducing the latter convenience was, no doubt, to secure the taking of an equal and not too large quantity of water, which, according to the rubrics, is to be added to the wine before consecrating. It is still the custom in many places to use this spoon, and the S. Congregation answered an inquiry of the late Archbishop Kenrick as to its lawfulness, saying that it was not forbidden: "usum parvi cochlearis non esse prohibitum."[1]

The rubrics of the Missal prescribe that the chalice be of gold or silver, or that at least the cup be of silver, covered on the inside with gold.[2] Exceptionally, by reason of poverty or necessity, less precious material has been allowed for the manufacture of the sacred vessels, such as a mixture of lead and silver, tin, and aluminium,[3] but in all cases the inside of the cup is to be gold. Forbidden are the use of brass and kindred metals, which rust, as well as of glass and wood;[4] although this restriction applies mainly to the cup, and for the rest is intended to secure the solidity and cleanliness of the sacred vessels.[5] Precious stones, pearls, and enamel or

[1] S. R. C. 6 Feb. 1858.—Decr. Auth. 5256, Balt. Dub. iv.

[2] Rit. servand. in celebrat. missæ, i., 1.

[3] The S. Congregation has limited the use of aluminium to a certain percentage of the component parts, among which are to be a given quantity of gold and silver. Cf. Acta S. Sed., vol. II., 232; vol. VI., 590.

[4] De Defect. in celebr. miss., x., 1.

[5] Cf. Quarti, II., t. i., 2; De Herdt, I., 172.

artistic chasing of a suitable and sacred character are of course in full keeping with the object for which the chalice serves.

If the chalice be made of silver or less precious material, it becomes necessary to have the inside of the cup regilt from time to time, as the constant friction of frequent purification gradually wears the inner surface away. As it is necessary to have the chalice again consecrated by the bishop each time that it is regilt,[1] a thick plating of gold, if not entirely gold cups, are the most desirable for chalices which are in daily use.

CONSECRATION.

The ancient sacramentaries or missals dating back to the sixth century contain special formulas for consecrating the chalice and paten. The rite is nearly the same as that found in the Roman Pontifical of to-day. It can only be performed by a bishop in his own diocese, and he is not empowered to delegate his faculty to another priest, without apostolic indult. The Holy See has occasionally granted the faculty to simple priests in missionary countries and to abbots for their respective communities, but it is not included in the privilege which allows the wearing of the episcopal insignia. According to an ancient custom at Rome, an unconsecrated chalice used by the Sovereign Pontiff at his Mass is considered as *ipso facto* consecrated. Such chalices are usually given to the Pontifical Sacristan, who presents them in turn to the Holy Father for the celebration of his Mass. It is probably this practice which has given rise to the erroneous assertion of some liturgical writers, who maintain that a chalice once used in the celebration of the Holy Mysteries is thereby consecrated. Theologians deny the inference as legitimate, although the S. Congregation has on several occasions decided that a chalice consecrated by a person unlawfully delegated should not be reconsecrated if Mass has

[1] Ex Decr. S. R. C. 14 Jun. 1845; 9 Maj. 1857, n. 5232, 1.

been said with it afterwards.[1] But if the error is ascertained before the chalice has been used at Mass, it has to be consecrated anew, unless there be grave reasons, such as scandalizing the faithful who have witnessed the first consecration, etc. If a bishop or one having the faculty of consecrating within certain limits, as in his diocese or congregation, consecrate outside of these limits, the consecration, though the act was illicit, is not to be repeated by another.

The chalice loses its consecration when it breaks in such a way as to render it useless in its broken state for the decent celebration of Mass. Thus it needs to be reconsecrated if the cup be injured so as to make consecration in it dangerous because of the risk of spilling the sacred contents; also if the parts are separated by a break.[2] If the inner coating of gold is worn out of the cup, although the chalice cannot be said to lose its consecration thereby, yet there is a grave obligation of having a fresh gilding provided. This done, the chalice requires new consecration. A slight alteration or repair of a chalice does not deprive it of its consecration, but liturgists say that it is becoming to wash the same with holy water before using it, whenever it has been profaned by unauthorized use.[3]

Ordinarily and apart from cases of necessity, the chalice, if consecrated, may not be handled by any one but clerics in sacred or minor orders. If it contains the precious Blood it cannot be touched under pain of mortal sin by any one, even by means of a cloth or gloves, except priests and dea-

[1] Neque universim pro probabili haberi potest aliquorum veterum opinio, vasa vel vestimenta sacra, si ante consecrationem vel benedictionem sive bona sive mala fide sacrificio missæ servierint, pro jam consecratis haberi posse: quod tamen admisit S. R. C. pro vasis sacris jam adhibitis, quæ a sacerdote illegitime delegato consecrata erant, 22 Sept. 1703 in *Fuldensi*, Gardell., n. 3663, ad iii. Cf. Lehmk. Theol. Mor. II., n. 288.

[2] Chalices used for missionary purposes are frequently made so that the parts, which are joined by screws, may be separated. These do not lose their consecration by being taken apart.

[3] De Herdt, l. c. 174.

cons. A decision of the S. Congregation permits the subdeacon to carry the chalice, though not purified, from the altar to the credence table at the first and second Mass of Christmas.[1] For the rest, it belongs to the bishop to give leave to lay-persons to touch the sacred vessels, which faculty is usually granted through pastors, and to religious communities.—What has been said thus far of the chalice holds good also for the *paten.* The edge of the latter should be sharp, so as to gather easily all the particles, which may be scattered upon the corporal. Those patens which usually accompany chalices of Gothic pattern are probably the most convenient. They have a plain surface gradually deepening towards the centre, and can be more easily purified than such as have circular cavities pressed into the plate. If entirely of gold, they should not be too heavy; if of silver, the upper surface must always be plated with gold. Inscriptions and emblems, even crosses, though they may enhance the appearance, are out of place on the paten, because they give occasion for small particles and dust to fasten in the lines of the engraved portions.

There is no particular time or place assigned for the consecration of the chalice and paten. From the words used in the Pontifical, it appears that the rite is performed in public.[2] The bishop vests in stole and mitre, as distinctive marks of his episcopal rank are required for this function. The paten is first blessed. The opening prayer likens it to the cross on which our divine Lord died.[3] The bishop makes the sign of the cross with chrism upon the paten from edge to edge, and then anoints the entire surface. In a like way he proceeds with the inner cup of the chalice. A priest then absorbs the chrism by means of bread, and cleanses paten and chalice, both of which are now represented as the holy se-

[1] Vid. Americ. Eccl. Review, vol. I., pag. 265.

[2] Oremus, fratres carissimi, ut divinæ gratiæ benedictio, etc.—Oremus, fratres carissimi, ut Deus, etc. De Patenæ et Calicis Consecr., Pontif. Rom.

[3] Consecret et sanctificet hanc patenam ad confringendum in ea Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui crucis passionem sustinuit.—Pontific. Rom., l. c.

pulchre in which Christ's body is to rest. Allusion is made to the preciousness of the metal and the beauty of the workmanship, which would yet fail to be worthy of the altar without the consecration and blessing of the Holy Ghost.[1] Chalice and paten are then sprinkled with holy water. The bread used in the wiping of the chrism is cast into the fire or the sacrarium.

CLEANSING.

The sacred purpose of chalice and paten, the care and reverence with which the disciplinary laws of the Church surround it, of themselves suggest the necessity of keeping these precious vessels scrupulously clean. Perhaps the legend of the holy Grail, which we mentioned at the beginning of this paper, has its pious purpose in giving the sacred cup with all its attendant blessings into the charge of Joseph of Arimathea, because it was he who, "buying fine linen, wrapped Him up in it and laid Him in a new sepulchre, wherein never yet any man had been laid."[2] St. Matthew says that it was "his own new monument which he had hewed out in a rock." Who would not deem it an honor without labor not only to bear at one's bosom the sacred Body of Christ, but to prepare the sepulchre and to guard it with his own hands. The decrees of Innocent III in the Lateran Council, and the Provincial Acts of St. Charles Borromeo[3] have become models for other synodical statutes which prescribe in detail the time and manner of cleansing the sacred vessels. They are to be kept wrapped in silk and never openly exposed. According to the statutes of Milan, priests, and clerics in sacred orders are to examine the chalices and patens frequently, at least every six months,

[1] Deus, qui legalium institutor es hostiarum, quique inter eas conspersam similaginem deferri in patenis aureis et argenteis ad altare tuum jussisti, etc.—Quod arte vel metalli natura effici non potest altaribus tuis dignum, fiat tua benedictione sanctificatum.—Pontif. Rom., l. c.

[2] Matth. xxii. 59; Luke xxiii. 52; John xix. 41.

[3] Act. Mediol. I., 275.

and to clean them with great care and reverence, in a vessel only used for that purpose, wherein corporals and purificators are also to be washed. Apart from this, they are to be kept bright and free from damp or other influences which may tarnish them. The complete furniture of a good sacristy includes a box with a few instruments, such as brushes, powder for cleansing metal, small pieces of chamois, and a steel pencil or similar contrivance by which hardened dust may be removed from the crevices. These things are easily obtained from any silversmith, and should be used exclusively for the cleaning of the sacred vessels.

VOCATIONS TO THE PRIESTHOOD AND OUR SEMINARIES.

In a letter addressed to the Bavarian bishops some years ago,[1] Leo XIII dwells upon the lofty mission of the Christian priesthood, especially in our day. He lays great stress upon the education of mind and heart which is to be given in ecclesiastical seminaries. "It has ever been," he says, "the first care of the Church to select and train to the priesthood such among the Catholic youth whose dispositions and wishes give an assured hope of their perseverance in the holy ministry. They should be educated from their early years in piety and religion, before bad habits have gained a hold upon them."[2] Further on he appeals to the clergy and bishops, pointing out the part they are to take in bringing about the necessary reforms in the education of candidates for the priesthood, so as to keep it abreast with the demands of these times. "The clergy will fulfil the duties devolving upon them in this respect thoroughly and entirely, if under the guidance of the bishops they strive by their influence to foster such dispositions in regard to ecclesiastical seminaries

[1] Encycl. Letter. 21. Dec. 1887.

[2] Cf. Conc. Trid., Sess. XXIII., 118.

as the dignity of the Christian priesthood on the one hand demands, and the progress and change of our times and manners, on the other, require. The teaching of the seminaries should indeed surpass all other institutions in excellence, and what is chief, those educated therein should by their reputation for virtue attract the minds of men to the doctrine which they teach, and lead them to its observance." He points out the necessity of a thoroughly classical education and of philosophy, "that deep and true philosophy, which investigates the loftiest problems and is the surest protectress of truth." All this he wishes the young clerics to accomplish before they enter upon the study of theology, that they may thus, by the superiority of their general knowledge, be able to emphasize the true value of those "precepts divine which regulate and direct the life of the priest," for his own welfare and that of the world. We have given the general drift of the encyclical. Briefly analyzed, it contains four points.

First: The youth destined for the sacred ministry are to be *selected* with great care from among those "whose dispositions and desires give hope of their ultimate perseverance."

Second: They are to be educated *from their earliest years* in piety and religion, "before bad habits have gained possession of them."

Third: The clergy under the guidance of the bishops are to foster such dispositions, and aid in facilitating measures likely to bring them about and becoming the dignity of the priesthood.

Fourth: In this they are to have regard "to the natural change of times and manners."

I.

It is of faith, that a divine vocation is required for the sacred office of the priesthood.[1] If it was so in the Old Testament, it must needs be so in the New.[2] Of Aaron it was

[1] Cf. Conc. Trid., Sess. XXIII., c. 4. [2] Heb. vii. 12.

said that Jehovah "chose him out of all men living to offer sacrifice to God;"[1] and Christ, gathering His disciples around Him on the eve of His passion, tells them: "You have not chosen me; but I have chosen you and have appointed you, that you should go and should bring forth fruit, and your fruit should remain."[2] It is of the special mission into the vineyard of the Master, into the fields where the harvest is ever ripe, but the laborers are few, that Our Lord spoke on that occasion. Hence Leo the Great aptly says: "The Church does not accept as priests any but such as the Holy Ghost has prepared, so that they are not called to guide God's people by reason of earthly preferences, but by the unction of heavenly grace"[3] And although from the very beginning of the Church men have sometimes assumed the sublime dignity of the priesthood through worldly and sinister motives, or without a heavenly call, yet "they have reigned, but not by me: they have been leaders, and I knew them not, says the Lord."[4] The prophet Jeremias has some awful words concerning the judgment of such as have forced their way uncalled into the sanctuary: "In the latter end you shall understand this counsel. I did not send prophets, yet they ran. I did not speak to them, yet they prophesied—that prophesy is a lie in my name. Behold I am against them, says the Lord: who use their tongues and say: The Lord saith it. . . . . I will forsake you and the city I gave to you. . . I will bring everlasting reproach upon you and perpetual shame, which shall never be forgotten."[5]

How do we recognize this special vocation? All the masters of the spiritual life agree that the first evidence of a boy's vocation to the priesthood is an early inclination towards that high office. This desire, spontaneous, constant, and marked whilst lawfully fostered, may never be directly urged by parents or guardians without danger to the child's purity

[1] Ecclus. xlv. 20.
[2] St. John xv. 16.
[3] Serm. de Nat. III., Op. I., 11.
[4] Osee viii. 4.
[5] Jerem. xxiii. 20, 25, 39.

of motive. A true vocation develops in time a silent attraction towards the things of the altar, a reverent longing to take part in the services of the Church, a sense of compassion for the poor, a natural shrinking from boisterous companionship, a modest eagerness to learn the tasks assigned at school, especially the Christian doctrine and sacred history. Such are the marks which, as far as human wisdom may judge, point out the child whom God would lead and fashion to the holy ministry. Sometimes His ways are different, when by strange circumstances a call to the service of the altar seems delayed, and yet is certain. Such cases are the exception, and rare. Their marks are equally plain in the possession of unusual zeal, deep humility, and great holiness or special aptitude for the work of the mission or teaching. Every one knows that the honors of the priesthood and also its emoluments may become the object of ambition. Yet this ambition may remain more or less hidden to the youth who is advanced to the priesthood, and for this as for much other self-knowledge he must depend on others, wiser and more experienced than himself.[1]

Besides a natural inclination and purity of motives in the choice of the priestly office, sufficient talent is required, giving promise that its functions will be fulfilled with becoming decorum and dignity. The fountain-heads whence flows a priest's efficacy are piety, prudence, knowledge. For, although it is true that the sacraments which he administers are the main channels of divine communication and grace, and are independent of or cannot be frustrated in their operation by the unworthiness or ignorance of him who administers them if he be rightly ordained, yet they cannot reach a people abandoned to the mercy of him who fails to attract or call them, or teach them how to find and benefit by the

[1] Alii enim eo consilio ad hanc vivendi rationem se convertunt, ut quæ ad victum vestitumque necessaria sunt parent, ita ut præter quæstum nihil aliud in sacerdotio, quemadmodum vulgo cæteri homines in quovis sordidi artificii genere, spectare vieantur.—Alios honorum cupiditas et ambitio ad sacerdotalem ordinem ducit.—Catech. Rom. II., c. vii., 4.

celestial treasures. The sacraments need faith in order to operate; but "faith comes by hearing," that is to say, by the zeal and charity of him who elucidates with knowledge and instructs with prudence. The Old Law forbade the ordaining to the priestly office of a man blind or lame or otherwise defective in body or mind. "Whoever has a blemish, he shall not offer bread to his God; neither shall he approach to minister to Him."[1] So, in the New Covenant, the eye of the intellect must be clear; the will not lame and sluggish and stumbling, but prompt and ready to do. There are faults of character which become a standing offence to our surroundings, though they may be bewailed in secret and forgiven. There are habits and sins which, indulged in for a long time, leave, so to speak, a scar upon a man's brow, weaken his powers of mind and heart, and leave him subject to strong inclinations for evil. These, if found in the young, unfit them for the service of the altar. Formerly any one who had been guilty of grave sins was debarred from aspiring to the priesthood, though he had done ample penance. "Etiam post pœnitudinem" says an ancient canon, "ac reconciliationem nulli unquam laico liceat honorem clericatus adipisci, quia quamvis sint omnium peccatorum contagione mundati, nulla tamen debent gerendorum sacramentorum instrumenta suscipere, qui dudum fuerunt vasa vitiorum."[2] St. Alphonsus, directing confessors how to deal with those who present themselves ready to enter the ecclesiastical state, says: "He who has but lately abandoned habits of sin, and not yet proved himself in the life of piety which is essential for the high dignity of the priesthood, is manifestly unworthy. If such a one attempts to receive sacred orders, he sins grievously by that very act, though he be otherwise in the state of grace."[3] A vocation may be lost or destroyed.

[1] Levit. xxi. 17.

[2] Synod. Carth. IV., can. 68.

[3] Cf. Homo Apostol., P. iii., tract. ult.

II.

Apart from a desire in the child to become a priest, and the requisite gifts for the proper exercise of the sacred functions, all the marks which prove and confirm a vocation are the result of training. The parent, the teacher may further or frustrate a vocation. What made Judas fail? He surely had a call from God. Was it perhaps that his early training neglected to crush an inherited tendency towards avarice? The constant discipline of those three years in the lovely companionship of the divine Master, in the sacred seminary of Christ, could not eradicate the habit once allowed to grow beyond the years of youth. In an evil hour, one, chosen among twelve, fell. It had been better for him had he never been born. Thus each vocation, with all its future results, magnificently fruitful or the tokens of awful ruin, rests in a measure upon parent and teacher.

It is an inspired proverb: "A young man according to his way, even when he is old, he will not depart from it."[1] Since the mother has the first and greatest influence over the child, we must turn our attention to her as an instrument by which we may foster vocations to the sacred ministry. The First Book of Kings gives us a beautiful picture of Samuel's priestly office and of the power by which he turned the people away from the worship of Baal and Astaroth. Yet, who can think of Samuel's greatness, in whose presence Saul and David grow faint, without remembering Anna leading the child of her tears and prayers to the temple, whilst still in his tender infancy, there to lay the foundation for the splendor of his sacerdotal reign. And there have been countless Christian women, like Anna, who with the mother of St. Athanasius said unto themselves: "I will, with the help of God, train this child to be a man of the Church."[2] These mothers have turned and shaped the destinies of communities and of nations.

[1] Prov. xxii. 6.

[2] Ventura, vol. I., § 20.

But who is to direct our mothers? Who is to turn their attention upon this great responsibility, paramount among all the duties of a parent's life. Who can best facilitate the ways and means by which the poor and unlettered in this rich and generous land of ours may recognize and strengthen the divine call perchance made to their little ones? It has been said, that there are amongst us fewer vocations to the priesthood and to the religious life than we should expect in proportion to the growth of the Catholic population. May it not be that many vocations are wrecked or dwarfed by reason of a want of training in accordance with their grave responsibilities among our mothers. Whether we call it worldliness among our wealthier Catholics, or ignorance and indolence among the poor, it is at bottom one and the same thing, namely, a want of appreciation of family life and family duties, which make it the first joy and the last care of parents to bring up their children in the love or at least intelligent attention to the things which lie beyond material wealth and comfort. The late Council of Baltimore plainly directs the attention of pastors to the means of developing priestly vocations by the influence which they may exercise upon the family circle in instructing our Christian mothers how to bring up their children.[1]

III.

In time the child, whom God has marked with sacred seal of a call to the ministry of the altar, passes from the hand of the parent to that of the teacher. To speak in this connection of the teacher is to speak of the pastor, the priest. However efficient may be those upon whom the labor of pedagogy mainly devolves, they are after all but the seconds, the helpmates of him to whose love and care not only the sheep but the lambs of the flock are emphatically entrusted.

[1] Parentes ipsos moneant ut filios dummodo signa veræ vocationis ostendant, ad ingrediendum statum clericalem sancte inducant; obstacula demum admovere satagant, quæ non raro ex familiæ egestate oriuntur.—Conc. Plen. Balt. III., Tit. v., 136.

When a boy wishes to enter the seminary he is required to have the testimony of his pastor, and that testimony is, according to the Council of Trent, to be founded on the well-assured knowledge of the virtue and talent of the child. Without such sponsorship no one is to be allowed to enter the seminary. But it may be asked, how can a pastor in a large city and with scattered congregations know every boy sufficiently well to recommend him on his own responsibility? There are many answers to this question, one of which is, that though every boy in the parish may not be personally known to him, those at least who are likely to be called to the priesthood would and should come under his closer observation. Their very vocation, if it be genuine, supposes that they show a preference for the service of the altar, approach the sacraments more regularly and devoutly, and attend religious instruction with a more marked zeal than those boys who have no such special attraction to the house of God. "If a pastor know any boy,"—says the Fourth Provincial Synod of Milan, "who desires to embrace the ecclesiastical state, he shall at once provide that the same be more diligently instructed in the sacred disciplines and the exercises of the spiritual life, that he assist frequently at church in the sacred functions, and that he be in a manner separated for the purpose of guarding and training him either by the pastor himself or by some other priest." Elsewhere the same synod decrees that, in order that a number of boys firmly grounded from their early years in piety, innocence of life, and knowledge may be trained up for the service of the Church, pastors should take boys of good talent and promise into their houses and instruct them in the mode of right living and the rudiments of science, and make from time to time a report of their charge to the bishop, that he may receive them into the seminary at the proper age. Benedict XIV urges the same method of preparing levites for the altar, and says that the home of every parish priest should be a sort of small seminary, where young students might be

edified and imbibe a love for the law of God and of sacred letters.[1] "Ut omnes presbyteri, qui sunt in parochiis constituti, juniores lectores secum in domo ubi ipsi habitare videntur recipiant: et eos quomodo boni patres spiritualiter nutrientes contendant.[2] Our own Council of Baltimore is scarcely less explicit. "We exhort in the Lord and earnestly beseech pastors and other priests, that they exercise especial vigilance in selecting and studying such boys among the flock committed to their care as seem to be well-fitted and called to the ecclesiastical state. If they find boys gifted with intelligence, piety, of devout and generous disposition, and with an inclination for study, who afford the hope that they will persevere in the service of the sacred ministry, let them nourish their zeal and eagerly foster the precious germs of their vocation, teaching them with paternal charity both pious practices and the rudiments of science, thus inciting them to study, and keep them with great care from the contamination of the world."[3]

This is indeed a great responsibility; but there are joys and lasting rewards in its immediate train. Many priests seek and find in the training of one or more youths preparatory to their entering the seminary a protection against dangers which frequently beset the solitary position of a missionary pastor. Apart from the fact that a priest can thus atone for the omissions of the past in his own education, and in teaching refresh or complete his classical and scriptural knowledge, he may make helpmates and friends of these young hearts, who are quick to appreciate the interest of a good tutor in their behalf. To educate a child in the ways of one's own profession soon becomes the keenest of pleasures, and not only beguiles our leisure hours in pleasant intercourse, but makes us look far ahead with a sort of pride toward the fruits which the young seedling will one day bear, and of which we are sure to reap our share. To neglect a vocation

[1] De Synod. Diœc,. Lib. V., c. xi

[2] Harduin. coll. II. col. 1105.

[3] Conc. Plen. Balt. III., Tit. V., c. i., 136.

which perchance grows up within the reach of the hand that can help and shelter it, is only less chargeable than to urge from human motives when God has not made it evident that there is a vocation. "Vocavi—et non respondistis," says Isaias,[1] but he adds also: "et quæ nolui, elegistis."

IV.

From the care of the priest and the teacher the boy is to pass into the preparatory seminary. With us in America he remains perhaps at the parochial school, if the grading permits it, or he goes to some college for a year or more, or he works in an office or store, or about the church, etc., until the time of his being admitted into the seminary has arrived, when he is probably sixteen or seventeen years of age. Whilst during the time which elapses between his first Holy Communion and his entrance into the seminary—a space of three or more years—he may learn the rudiments of Latin and other things which will be useful to him later on, he receives for the most part no special training in that which is most essential to him for the preservation and right use of his vocation. Yet the time from the thirteenth or fourteenth to the seventeenth year of a boy's life is without doubt the most important in forming his character. They are precisely the years when he needs to be guarded against temptations the destructive nature and permanent injury of which, if he yield to them, he has no means of measuring and can hardly suspect. It is the time when most men have cast the die which fixed their future fortune and shaped their subsequent views and aims. It is of comparatively little importance that the boy who applies for admission to the seminary at the age of sixteen or seventeen should not know his English grammar, or history, or arithmetic, because for several years before he had been obliged to work in order to help earning a sustenance for his family, or to provide himself with sufficient means to defray the necessary

[1] Is. lxv. 12.

expenses of a seminary course. These deficiencies can be supplied if he have talent and patience. But what he most needs, and what he can never supply if he has once lost it, is the discipline of the heart, the freedom from that contamination which is begotten by the too early knowledge of evil and the habitual sight of vice, the lofty appreciation of the high state to which he aspires, and the exceeding purity of mind and reverence which it exacts A vocation, no matter how true, does not guarantee that a child may not fall into sin and contract bad habits and get a low estimate of the priestly dignity. The loss of innocence impairs alike the judgment and the affections. These are more safely protected in early age by ignorance than by knowledge of wrong. The character of a boy, and this is eminently true of the American child, is already formed at the time when he is usually sent to the seminary. The discipline of the latter, even if kept up for ten years or more, as it is in some of our ecclesiastical institutions, is inadequate to effect a change of disposition which is more than temporary. The shape of the tree is already fixed. You may help it to grow, you may engraft the best of fruit slips, you may find the stem during all those years sufficiently flexible to yield to a rule, but let it go, and it will snap back. This probably accounts for the failures of vocations which seemed evident from every other point of view. The years most important for the setting, so to speak, of the vocation, are lost. Nor can a college, however good, under ordinary circumstances supply this loss. The boy mingles with others whose aspirations are more or less of a worldly character, whose parents desire them to study with a view of making good merchants and clever businessmen of them. Their tastes, their enjoyments, however innocent otherwise, are apt to turn enthusiasm into a direction wholly alien from that which the priestly mission pursues. We do not maintain that boys called to the priesthood should be prevented from giving vent in useful sport to the merry tones of their disposition. On the

contrary, that is essential, and the best students and the best priests are frequently the first to take a hand in healthy and manly play. But it is the general atmosphere in which the boy finds these things presented to his imitation which dulls his feelings and blinds him to higher aspirations. Great ideals, such as will make him aim at the noblest companionship in the priesthood, are naturally out of his reach in any of the conditions to which we have alluded, and when he comes to the seminary later on, they fail to make the proper impression upon the sensitive plate of his mind, which has already received other images, that now blur all subsequent lights.

This is without exception the experience of teachers and of those who have studied the discipline and life of seminaries in past ages. Our own actual practice, which allows the most fruitful years of the seminarist's life to pass without special care and cultivation, is no doubt a result of past necessity. But it does not stand the test of reason and, we venture to add, that of our own experience. If our clergy are intelligent and faithful in spite of these deficiencies in our seminary-training, it is owing to other causes, and we would no doubt have far superior results and more available vocations than at present, if the system of admission to the seminaries were modified. If contact with the world benefits a youth, it may be later on, when character is sustained by fixed and well understood principles, which mark a youth's aims and aspirations; but it is not at the age when he is comparatively helpless for want of a positive element within himself or around him to shield him from danger. Hence the German system of clerical education cannot be advanced as an argument against our plea; and even as it is, the bishops in Germany are at present prepared, since the Kulturkampf has given them the opportunity, of asserting their claims, to change the former system, and to adopt that laid down by the Council of Trent, which is founded upon educational principles that can be applied everywhere and without injury to the progressive movements of our day.

V.

The wisdom of the Council of Trent is apparent when it suggests the *age of twelve* for entrance into the seminary. "Whereas youth, unless rightly trained, is prone to follow the amusements of the world, and unless it be educated from its tender years unto piety before habits of evil have taken possession of the whole man, it will never, without the extraordinary help of God, persevere in the ecclesiastical state." The Council then ordains that every diocese should, according to its means and extent, in a college set apart for this sole purpose, educate a certain number of boys in ecclesiastical discipline and suitable studies. "Into this college shall be received such as are at least twelve years old, born in lawful wedlock, who have a competent knowledge of how to read and write, and whose morals and inclinations afford a hope that they will always serve in the ecclesiastical ministry.[1] The Council expresses the wish that the children of the poor should be principally selected for these schools, though it does not exclude the more wealthy, provided they give evident signs of vocation.

We are assured that the American hierarchy are anxious to introduce this system of early training as suggested by the Synod of Trent for those called to the ecclesiastical state; for the Council of Baltimore expressly lays this down as its aim. Speaking of preparatory seminaries, it has the following: "These seminaries are to shield from their earliest age (*tenerrima puerorum ætatula*) boys (who have a vocation to the holy ministry) against the influence of bad example and mingling with the world, during the time in which, by study and the discipline which forms their disposition, they prepare themselves for the theological seminary."[2] Again: "Since the preparatory seminaries are, so to speak, the training schools (*tirocinia*) for fostering piety and forming the

[1] Conc. Trid., sess. xxiii., c. 18.

[2] Conc. Plen. Balt. III., Tit. v., c. i., 139.

sacerdotal character, they are to fashion the recruits for the sacred militia from their earliest years, so that they grow up like young plants around the Tabernacle of the Lord (*tamquam novellæ plantationes succrescentes*), and be educated in innocence of life, religion, modesty, and the ecclesiastical spirit; and that at the same time they may learn the humanities and enter into the higher studies." [1]

But the sooner this measure is carried into practice, the better it will be for the Church of America, and the more surely shall we obtain a sufficient number of vocations to keep pace with the quickly growing needs of the Catholic communities all over the continent. There are serious difficulties in the way of accomplishing this, but they are in no proportion to the advantages to be gained from a thoroughly and uniformly trained priesthood. Some of our dioceses, well equipped in every other respect and provided with seminaries, could surely make a beginning, which would soon reveal its advantages. As it is at present, students from various colleges and from no colleges flock to the examinations for admission to the seminary. They are differently trained. Some excel in mathematics or in English, having no knowledge of the classics; others are wholly deficient in these branches, whilst they are well up in Christian Doctrine, and have studied Latin and Greek, and for the rest evince excellent dispositions. This makes the work of the teacher in the seminary very difficult and puts the student in an awkward position, who, owing to lack of uniform training, is obliged to go back and lose much valuable time or else is constantly kept dragging in the rear of a class in which he is partly deficient and partly in advance. The opening of preparatory seminaries for boys of a younger age than are generally admitted at present would, moreover, take away the temptation from many to go to work instead of entering at once upon the studies that are to fit them for their ultimate duties. The little hard experience gained by a boy's being

[1] L. c. 141.

cast into the turmoil of the world, where he is taught to earn a living, are no compensation for the loss sustained by the mental enervation which secular habits of thougt and activity engender, and which a boy brings with him into the seminary without ever getting wholly rid of them. Experience of the world is only useful to him who is not likely to be shipwrecked by it, and who has strength sufficient to bear the rude shocks it offers and to withstand the slippery attractions which line its pathways. The hard steel is not produced by simply putting iron under the tilt-hammer, but bars of the metal are first broken and heated in bundles and welded together with a forge-hammer before they receive the blows that make them resist the mother-metal, and at other times yield, where the latter would break. True, some characters develop strength in early battling with temptations, yet these are the exceptions to the rule established by the experience of generations and attested by the patient and consistent labor of the Church in this direction.

And it is not to be lost sight of, that alone by a system of clerical training which takes the boy at an early age, are we enabled to bring the education in our seminaries to that perfection which Leo XIII bespeaks for it. The priest has to know and hence learn so much more than the men of other professions, and it takes a long course of years to complete it, even as it is now. The plan of studies at present generally pursued in the seminaries can hardly be curtailed. We need all the time we can get, and most so those first years, when a positive foundation is laid in heart and mind. Many ecclesiastics, who have been obliged to enter the seminary late, regret their deficiency by reason of the loss of what is the golden morning hour of a student's life.

An objection may be raised against the practicability of at present instituting preparatory seminaries for boys, or admitting them, say at the age of twelve, into those which are already in existence. The expense would be too great. The necessity of meeting it must fall either upon the students, who

are generally poor, or upon the diocese, which has other needs to provide for, that appear more pressing.—We do not wish to minimize the force of this objection. Let us suppose that none of our boys would be prepared to pay their way in the preparatory seminary, and that the whole burden of supporting the institution would fall upon the faithful. We ask, are these seminaries less important than our schools, our orphanages, and the like, where the young are gratuitously educated for secular life? Or is not the gain, if we only compute its ultimate results, immensely above what can be acquired in any other direction by similar sacrifices on the part of our people? Our churches are the pride of every city where Catholicity has a foothold, and costly school buildings are daily multiplying over the land. These are to protect and strengthen the interests of the faithful. Can we spare no part of the outlay to provide for the equipping of priests, who, with a perfect education, and the sacerdotal spirit kept intact within them, gain thousands to the faith who are now slumbering in the shadow of infidelity, heresy, and lukewarmness because we lack in our midst priestly vocations, which will provide able and vigilant shepherds for the scattered flocks? And it would not be so difficult, perhaps, to enlist the co-operation of intelligent and wealthy Catholics in furthering such a project. This has been proved by the growing into existence of the Catholic University. It might further be objected that taking boys into the seminary at that early age would expose us to the danger of having many enter the seminary who, after having obtained a good education, would leave for want of a vocation to the priesthood, and thus be a source of constant risk and loss to the diocese. It could hardly be said that one who enters the seminary, obtains a good education, and then returns to secular life, is a loss to the community, if he have really profited by the education thus gratuitously received. But if pastors follow out the directions of the Church in selecting and watching over the boys whom they

will send to the seminary, there will be few of such cases. However much we might magnify the inconveniences attaching to this system of early training for the future levites of the altar, the gain would always be far in excess towards the common good.

THE OFFERTORY IN THE MISSA DE REQUIE.

What does it mean?

In all the Masses for the souls of the faithful departed, as found in the Roman Missal, we read the following *offertory:* "Domine Jesu Christe, Rex gloriæ, libera animas omnium fidelium defunctorum *de pœnis inferni* et de profundo lacu: libera eas de ore leonis, *ne absorbeat eas tartarus, ne cadant in obscurum:* sed signifer sanctus Michael repræsentet eas in lucem sanctam, quam olim Abrahæ promisisti et semini ejus. Hostias et preces tibi, Domine, laudis offerimus: tu suscipe pro animabus illis, quarum hodie memoriam facimus: fac eas, Domine, de morte transire ad vitam, quam olim Abrahæ promisisti et semini ejus." This is the only form of offertory which has been preserved unchanged and unabridged as it is found in the old sacramentaries or missals dating back to the time of St. Gregory the Great, or about the end of the sixth century. It was apostolic tradition that, when the Christians, having assembled to assist at the holy sacrifice, had made their confession of sins and profession of faith, they approached the altar and offered gifts, bread wrapt in spotless linen, and wine and oil contained in pure vessels, or alms of money. From these offerings was selected so much as was necessary for the holy sacrifice and the service of the temple. The rest was distributed among the poor, who daily presented themselves at the gate for that purpose. St. Augustine appears to have been the first[1] who, in imitation

[1] Retractationum L. II., c. 11.

of the Hebrew Church at the time of Simon the High priest, introduced the chanting of canticles and responses, alternately by the clergy and people, whilst these offerings were going on.[1] The custom passed from Carthage to Rome, and the liturgical books from the fifth to the tenth century contain certain appropriate antiphons and responses, called offertories, adapted to all the seasons of the ecclesiastical year, and parts of which were to be repeated until all the faithful had made their offerings. After the tenth century this mode of bringing gifts to the altar during the service was discontinued, at least in the Latin churches. The faithful who wished to make offerings could do so before or after the holy sacrifice, which practice, according to some, gave rise to the offering of stipends for Mass. The chanting of the antiphons and responses during this portion of the liturgy was thus shortened, and at present the part styled *offertorium* in the missal consists simply of a single verse, which embodies the sentiment of the corresponding feast or ecclesiastical season. Sometimes it has the form of a prayer,[2] or it is a joyous expression of praise or congratulation,[3] or again it is a snatch of inspired truth, expressing hope or recalling a lesson for reflection.[4] But the Masses *de Requie* have retained the original form of offertory, consisting of an antiphon, a verse, and a repetition of the concluding words of the former; for, according to Romsée, the custom of making oblation of bread or wax or alms still continued in many places during the solemn Mass for the dead.[5]

[1] "Simon the High Priest, the Son of Onias, who in his life propped up the house, and in his days fortified the temple. . . . about him was the ring of his brethren . . . and the oblation of the Lord was in their hands, before all the congregation of Israel . . . .and the singers lifted up their voices, and in the great house the sound of sweet melody was increased."—Ecclus. l. seq.

[2] Confirma hoc Deus, quod operatus es in nobis.—*Miss. de Spir. Sancto.*

[3] Felix namque es, sacra Virgo Maria.—*Miss. de B. V.*

[4] In te speravi Domine; dixi: Tu es Deus meus, in manibus tuis tempora mea. —*Miss. ad postulandam gratiam bene moriendi*—Veritas mea et misericordia mea cum ipso, et in nomine meo exaltabitur cornu ejus.—*Conf. non Pont.*

[5] Porro retentum est in his potius quam in aliis missis, quia in iis, dum sunt

Regarding the authenticity of this offertory there can be no doubt. The same words, just as we find them in the Roman Missal of to-day, have been used at least for the last twelve hundred years, throughout the Western Church. Yet, as they stand, they appear to present a serious difficulty in the way of Catholic dogma. This is all the more singular because the liturgy of the Church is universally accepted as an evidence of her constant teaching. "Forma precandi est lex credendi." The ancient faith is uninterruptedly preserved in public worship, which could never be altered without the change becoming marked not only by reason of the uniformity of the liturgical books throughout the Catholic world, but by the difficulty of introducing a different version among the people, who, unlettered and without the aid of printed books, learned only through oral tradition.

The difficulty alluded to touches, as will be noticed, two points of Catholic belief. In the first part we have the words: "Libera animas omnium fidelium defunctorum de pœnis *inferni*." Although the word *infernum* is ordinarily translated as hell, many writers, among whom are Gavantus, Benedict XIV, Sporer, and some of more recent date, contend that it is to be understood here in the sense of *purgatorium*, since according to Catholic dogma, founded on Sacred Scripture, "ex inferno nulla est redemptio." We need have no scruple in admitting the translation of *infernum* into purgatory. The word in either sense is of ecclesiastical coining, and Carpentier, in his supplement to the Glossary of Du Cange, notices besides this case in point another instance of the same kind.[1] Nevertheless, the original difficulty not only revives in the next passage, but adds another. "Ne

solemnes, in multis locis, præsertim ruri, ad offertorium hodie dum fiunt oblationes vel panum, vel cereorum, aut saltem pecuniæ.—Toss. Jos. Romsée, Praxis Celebr. Miss., edit. Hazé, 1854, Tom. II., p. I., cap. 3, art. 13. iii.

[1] Infernum pro purgatorium, in offertorio missæ pro defunctis; ita etiam usurpant Monita S. Eligii in vita ejusdem. Tom. II. Spicil.—Glossar. nov. ad scriptores medii ævi cum latinos tum gallicos seu supplementum ad auctiorem Glossarii Cangiani editionem. Paris, 1776.

absorbeat eas *tartarus*, ne *cadant* in obscurum," cannot refer to purgatory, since we must suppose the souls of the faithful departed to be there already. Nor is it on the other hand consistent with Catholic dogma to believe that these souls are still exposed to the danger of passing from the purifying flames of purgatory to the eternal fires of hell. Benedict XIV does not meet this difficulty when he says: "Quibus verbis non pro iis rogat ecclesia, qui perpetuis inferorum pœnis addicti sunt; neque ignorat, nunquam futurum ut animæ Purgatorio detentæ ad inferos dejiciantur.[1] Others hold that the passage "ne absorbeat eas tartarus," etc., is equivalent to "ne diutius detineat" or "ne post hoc sacrificium denuo in Purgatorii pœnas incurrere."[2] But it is evident that such version does violence to the plain meaning of the terms in their context, and it is difficult to assign a reason why they should have been introduced with what was certainly an unusual signification.

II.

Other writers, among whom are Suarez, Merati, Franzelin,[3] more consistently render *infernum, tartarus, obscurum* in the sense of hell. Benedict XIV mentions this view in passing, without endorsing it, as he could not have done owing to his translation of the first part.[4]

These authors picture the Church as returning in spirit to the hour of death, before the eternal doom of the soul is decided. She apparently wishes to emphasize the fact that her supplications accompany the souls of her children dur-

[1] Bened. XIV De S. Missæ Sacrf. Lib. II., c. ix., n. 4. Edit. Rom. 1748, vol. IX.

[2] Gobat Alph. sacrific. n. 172, apud Gihr, d. h. Messopfer, II., § 45, note.

[3] Cf. also Card. Wiseman, Lect. II. on Holy Week, p. 58.

[4] Quidem considerant, eam Antiphonam legi consuevisse cum ægrotus aliquis in eo esset ut jamjam emitteret animam; ac putant deinde ecclesiam in missis et funeribus mortuorum eam adhibere cœpisse, retrahendo preces ad punctum illud temporis, quo animæ e corporibus sunt egressæ; eodem plane modo, quo Adventus tempore illis utitur verbis: Rorate cœli desuper et nubes pluant justum, etc. — Bened. XIV, l. c.

ing the transit from this life into the next. This form of dramatic transposition, which appeals to the living, who in this case are made to chant a sort of processional prayer as they follow their departing brother into eternity, is not uncommon in the liturgy of the Church. The prayers of Advent and Holy Week in several instances carry us back to the time when the devout Hebrew was awaiting the accomplishment of the Messianic facts, although we have for centuries been enjoying the fruits of the same. Such is the interpretation which the majority of liturgical writers in our own day give to the words of this offertory. They see in it an expression of the poetic or dramatic element in Catholic worship, intended to move the faithful more powerfully to the contemplation of their own last end and to the charity which brooks no delay in assisting their departed brethren.[1]

III.

We must confess that the above explanation, although advocated by unquestionably high authority, does not wholly satisfy us. Nor does it seem to be necessary that we attribute to these words a poetic character, since the sentiment which is thus professedly brought out lies in the bare words themselves if we simply abandon the idea of the offertory being a prayer in behalf of those souls for whom the holy sacrifice is directly applied. We shall at once make clear the interpretation which we intend by translating the offertory, as it stands, into English: "Lord Jesus Christ, king of glory, deliver *the souls of all the faithful, when they have*

[1] Sacerdos non orat proprie, ut animæ jam exutæ corpore ac a Deo judicatæ liberentur ab inferno ac de morte ad vitam transeant (hoc enim vanum esset), sed, ut magis commoveat adstantes, per prosopopœiam repræsentat sibi ac populo illas animas quasi jamjam egressuras e corpore ac divino judicio repræsentandas, et proponit ob oculos pericula, in quibis in illo articulo versantur, et pro illis quasi in eo statu constitutis Deo supplicat, ut eas liberet, quod nullo modo frustra fit. Nam et multum confert ad concitandos adstantium animos ad pietatem et horrorem Divini judicii, et illæ preces etiam apud Deum habent suum effectum, quatenus ex intentione Ecclesiæ et sacerdotum funduntur, ut per eas Deus liberet eas animas a pœnis Purgatorii, si iis forte detinentur.—Conninck, Dr. Sacram., qu. 83, n. 262.

departed (defunctorum), from the pains of hell and the deep abyss; free them from the jaws of the lion, lest Tartarus swallow them up, lest they fall into darkness; but let the standard-bearer St. Michael bring them into the holy light, which Thou didst once promise to Abraham and his progeny. We offer Thee, O Lord, gifts and prayers of praise. Accept them for those souls of whom we make commemoration this day: make them, O Lord, pass from death to the life which Thou hast promised," etc. It will be noticed that we leave the words *infernum*, *tartarus*, *obscurum*, unchanged in their literal meaning, and simply translate *defunctorum* by "when they have departed." There is nothing forced in this rendering of *defunctorum*, which refers to souls *after* their departure from this life, when they stand before the judgment seat of God. On the other hand, there is not only nothing to indicate that this particular clause applies to those who have just died, but it speaks distinctly of the souls of *all the faithful* (omnium fidelium defunctorum), that is, all those who may stand in need of the divine mercy after they shall have died. This seems not only in harmony with the entire text, but also with the general purpose of the offertory, which, as we remarked before, is frequently an admonition to the living, and in this case a prayer that, when they themselves come to die, God may avert the danger of eternal punishment from them. At the same time it does not exclude those who are represented as standing before the judgment seat of God to receive sentence. There can be no doubt that the holy sacrifice offered in behalf of individual souls influences the judgment even by prevention, just as the fruits of the redemption were applied by anticipation to the judgment by which many souls in the Old Testament remained in limbo until the time was accomplished, instead of forfeiting heaven. The Church, therefore, in praying for the dead, regards the *moment of judgment* as it affects all the faithful, living and dead, as if she uttered a solemn truth in warning and in the form of prayer suitable to all. Viewed in this light, it is

needless to assume that by a figure of speech the Church represents herself as returning to the time before death, when the soul is on the point of departing. This supposition is still more weakened when we compare it with other parts of the liturgy of the dead. In the oration for the Mass "In die obitus seu depositionis defuncti" we have the following: Deus .... te supplices exoramus pro anima famuli tui N., *quam hodie de hoc sæculo migrare jussisti: ut non tradas in manus inimici*, neque obliviscaris in finem, etc. This refers to a soul already departed. Even more plainly we have the same idea expressed in the liturgy of the exequies after the Mass: Non intres in judicium cum servo tuo, Domine .... sed mereatur *evadere judicium ultionis, qui dum viveret*, insignitus est, etc. Quite in harmony with this sentiment is the last part of the offertory itself. After the priest and chanters have prayed that all the faithful, whenever they shall have departed this life, may avoid the jaws of hell, and be led to the eternal light promised to Abraham and his seed, which is likewise Christ and His faithful children, a new verse introduces the special application of the offering made then and there in behalf of those for whom the Mass is being celebrated. "Sacrifice and prayer of praise we present to Thee, O Lord: accept it for those souls of whom we make commemoration this day: grant them to pass from death to that life which Thou hast promised to Abraham and his progeny." We would call attention to the last passage *de morte transire ad vitam* as strengthening our proposition. *Mors* does not mean "hell." It is "death" simply. The soul after death receives judgment, which assures it of eternal salvation, even though it be retained for a time in purgatory; and this salvation is the *vita*, the life, which has been promised to Abraham and to all the faithful of Christ. The words "libera animas omnium defunctorum de pœnis inferni—ne cadant in obscurum—fac eas, Domine, de morte transire ad vitam" need therefore no prosopopœia to explain their true meaning. It is this: Deliver, O Lord, the

souls of all Thy children, when they shall have died, from the peril of hell—make them pass from death to the assurance of life eternal, and mitigate the sentence of those who have presently died in virtue of the holy sacrifice of which Thy wisdom and mercy determines in advance the fruits.

LETTERS TO A RELIGIOUS.

Expression in Painting.

II.

In my last letter I promised to speak more in detail of the aim which the true artist has to keep in view in painting the human countenance. There are certain gifts in man which distinguish him emphatically from all other creatures. These gifts are commonly reflected in the face. According as the painter can produce them in their perfection upon the canvas we would call him a master of his art. To do so requires a bringing out and blending of physical, intellectual, and moral beauty. One or the other of these three elements may predominate, but in every true work of art they must support each other in such a way as to call forth intelligent pleasure in the beholder. In so far as this is the case in a portrait, it may be styled a work of fine art, independent of its correctness as a likeness to the original. Let me here give you a definition of fine art which has been generally endorsed by competent masters both old and new. *A work of fine art is the immediate product of human genius containing those elements of beauty which awaken intelligent pleasure in the beholder.*

Note the parts. A work of art must be the direct result of human genius. It excludes all the products of merely mechanical action, whether originally contrived by man or the direct effect of the operation of nature, as, for instance, in

photography. Genuine art of painting owns no other parent than the hand of man instructed by his mind and heart. The fervor of affection heats the imagination to swift and energetic motion. Both take their impulse from the admiration of the subject which is before the artist, whose skilled sense is guided within lines of right proportion, and whose intelligence and moral sense limit him to truth, whether of the real or the ideal order. This limitation is important. Genius cannot be allowed to soar with extravagance, for in this it would violate one of its canons, according to which it must represent what is beautiful. This is expressed in the second part of our definition of art. It must contain those elements of beauty which awaken intelligent pleasure.

What are these elements of beauty? First, that which renders a thing beautiful by reason of the *harmony which it suggests as existing between itself and some intellectual or moral truth.* This quality is capable of spontaneously arousing in us a love for or a high appreciation of the object represented. It is what we commonly mean when we speak of a thing as beautiful. We are struck by a certain conformity in the work before us to a preconceived perfection. The next element of beauty is that which we term *sublime.* It awakens not so much our love as our admiration, because of its greatness, whether physical, intellectual, or moral. Under this head we include the things which impress us as tragic or in any sense imposing, without bringing us so to say into personal touch with the subject. A third element is *grace.* It is a quality which is difficult to define. Beauty may exist when grace is wanting. Without identifying it with perfection of form or of motion, we might call it the manner in which the object represented speaks to the beholder. I say, it is not motion or pose, although frequently taken in that sense. The Greeks seem to have understood by it that which gives a charm to perfect beauty, apart from it. Thus the veil thrown over the face of modesty may heighten the impression of its beauty, although the features are actually

hidden. It is probably the conscious existence of a moral power which acts upon the beholder in producing this impression. The fourth element of beauty is *truth*. This needs some explanation. Man's mind is naturally inquisitive. He seeks truth by a sort of instinct. Accordingly its discovery is accompanied by a distinct pleasure in the intelligence, which can only be interfered with by other and stronger attachments, which have pre-engaged his mind through an act of the will. But truth is not confined to the religious sphere or the field of facts. Everything that is novel, strange, or comic, so long as it produces pleasure in the intelligence without offending against the general laws of moral as well as physical beauty, is a proper subject of fine art. *Variety* has also been classed by many as one of the elements of beauty.

I must yet call your attention to the third part of our definition. It is essential that a work of fine art appeal to the intellect of man. Hence the representation of physical beauty, so far as it appeals exclusively to the senses, cannot be called by that name. It is true that the intellect is more or less active in connection with all perception of the senses. But I speak here of the aim of the artist and not of the accidental effect which his picture may produce. The refined materialism of modern times has endeavored to attach the name of art to all such productions of the human intelligence and hand as cause pleasure to the senses. This has lowered the standard of art and brought it under the pretensions of the coiffeur and the modiste. Such was not its character even among the pagans in the times when they wrought those admirable works which we still admire as patterns of true beauty. There is a true grace, a reserve, and at the same time unconsciousness in the statues of Phidias and his contemporaries which betoken the highest moral sense. True, this cannot be said of all the Greek works of art preserved by us as precious relics of the fine sense of the beautiful in form and action which that nation produced in sub-

sequent ages. Still, it is universally acknowledged that Greek art attained its highest merit under the influence of the most perfect moral code which that people ever possessed, and that with the age and the reforms of Pericles vanished also by degrees the excellence of its art. The very name, "art" was the equivalent, in their language, of virtue, as understood by the Roman, that is to say, as the expression of every noble quality that can grace a citizen. If great artists were esteemed in all ages even above statesmen and princes, it was not because they could do beautiful things, but because they exercised an influence over the public. Their power to teach, to correct common wrongs, to chastise folly, and to reform the mind of the people without appearing to do so, was felt and gave them the ascendancy over entire nations. Whenever they ceased to be independent and began to flatter the depraved tastes of their patrons, they lessened the perfection of their art. As soon as they yielded their higher aims to that of pleasing the outward sense, they opened the door to what was morally ugly, and their works could no longer claim the name of being in every sense beautiful.

You see, then, how all that pretends to the name of fine art must proceed from and appeal to the intelligence of man. It must do so by means of the beautiful; and when we say the beautiful, we necessarily include the good. Whatever is bad is, as I have just said, morally ugly, and hence contradicts æsthetical beauty. It is needless to prove this after the manner of philosophers, for it must be quite clear to you. Only, to prevent an objection which might be urged in this connection, I would say, that not everything which by itself is ugly need be so when part of a work of fine art. On the contrary, the contrast often produced by the presentation of what is ugly or repulsive in a picture serves to heighten the effect of the moral, or may be even necessary to carry out the full intelligence of the idea which the artist had in mind. Hence these features need not be excluded from a perfect work of art, and at times are essential to it. Thus we appre-

hend the benefits which the possession of certain virtues secures to us frequently much better when they are represented in conjunction with the sad results brought about by their absence. Even in music, which appeals much more to the feelings than to the intelligence, we have an occasional dissonance designedly introduced into a theme, as a transition to unexpected harmony, the pleasing effect of which is thereby much heightened. In the same way the painter depicts anger, cruelty, avarice, remorse, madness for the purpose of emphasizing with greater relief the opposite virtues. The effect of a work of art must therefore be taken in its entirety, and according as it awakens the response of the intelligence to the perception of true beauty will it lay claim to the title of a work of art. For this reason it is necessary that you should study the various expressions of the human countenance in their principles of motion; not only those which show forth the beautiful and nobler qualities of the human soul, but likewise such as indicate its defects and weaknesses. Applying the principles which have thus far been laid down to the human countenance, we must conclude that its beauty lies mainly in the play of features, that is to say, in *action*. All the qualities of mind and heart are brought out in their full perfection only by the operation of the will. The most exact proportion of parts in a face, the happiest blending of colors to give it life, will fail to awaken that sympathy of the intelligence which makes us realize man's actual nobility. You find an example of this in some of the Byzantine pictures. They possess not unfrequently faultless harmony of parts and an extreme delicacy in texture, yet they appear to us like copies from models in wax, stiff and lifeless, without touching any note within us.

As the discourse of the mind and the emotions of the heart vary, so varies the expression of the human countenance in type and degree of beauty. It is this action of the face which the genius of the painter interprets, because he recognizes the same action in himself. This likeness, understood

and seized in an instant, animates his whole being and directs his hand, armed with the instrument of brush or pencil, to the use of which he has become accustomed. The thing of beauty which he sees, whether in reality or in imagination, is like the object which evokes the electric spark and swiftly animates it with motion and light. The joyous ring of a laugh, the tremor of expectation in our voice, the awe that throws fetters about our feet and makes us pause—these are but similar effects of the inward emotion, marked through the outward senses. As the lines of our handwriting might under circumstances show some strong feeling of fear or joy or confidence, so in a similar way does the brush of the painter reflect his living genius when it has been aroused to enthusiastic activity.

But the artist does even more than to represent the living emotions of man through his countenance. He eliminates and perfects nature, and thus creates that which is no longer a mere reproduction of what exists, but an ideal pointing to a higher perfection, or to what man *may* be. Imagine a hero in the moment of some sublime action—the glow of life upon his cheeks, the swell of the muscles produced by the eagerness of his bent, his soul's emotions full upon his face, all telling you as plainly as possible of the noble purpose written in his mind. Suppose that in such an attitude his features, without the slightest change, were by some freak of nature suddenly petrified. We could not call this a piece of art in the sense in which we here speak of it, because it is simply the product of nature and not of man. But let us assume that an artist with the keen perception and the swift skill of Michael Angelo could seize the same heroic action and work it out with the utmost accuracy in a block of marble or upon the canvas. It would be a work of art absolutely and perfectly true to nature, and yet it would depend upon the artist to make it still more perfect. For, if there had been in the original which served him for a model, and in the imitation of which he found it possible to be

scrupulously exact, aught of a natural defect, whether in form or action, the artist, by omitting it, would heighten the beauty of his work. To satisfy the canons of his profession, he would be even obliged to do so—provided always that the defect indicated did not in any way contribute to emphasize the action of the hero and rendering it in reality more beautiful. Thus art surpasses nature, not only in this, that it has a distinct motive by which it appeals to man's higher nature, but also in that it eliminates whatever is on æsthetic grounds defective. Nature is, of course, in a sense, and is intended to be, imperfect. It is the aim of art, like that of religion in an other sphere, to bring us back and raise us to the state in which man was before the fall and would be without original sin, in the effects of which all creatures participate.

Such is the aim and object of your art. Recognized and acted out, it is art truly immortal, because its beauty affects the soul, which survives and transcends all material things. We, who have emancipated ourselves from the service of fashion,—paint not for time but for eternity. In my next, I shall speak of the limits which the true artist must observe in pursuing the aim which has been pointed out.—*Addio.*

THE MORAL LIMIT IN THE USE OF ANÆSTHETICS.

Pain is an ordinary symptom of disease, and generally indicates its seat and nature. Man, like the lower animal, has an instinctive abhorrence of suffering, and he uses the means which his intelligence points out to free himself from it. Of late years important discoveries in the field of experimental medicine and chemistry have led to the frequent use of remedies by which pain can be allayed. Although these remedies do not themselves remove the cause of the suffering, they are indirectly of great advantage in bringing

about cures, independent of the fact that they diminish the pain. Surgeons and physicians by their aid are enabled to obtain a more accurate diagnosis of certain diseases than could be done formerly. They perform with more safety and success the most delicate operations, and thus save a large number of lives which under other circumstances would be considered as lost. The relaxation of the muscular fibres by itself, brought on in the state of insensibility, frequently makes serious operations unnecessary by reducing certain forms of dislocation, hernia, and the like. In obstetrics the use of these means is invaluable at least in some critical cases, and as narcotics they serve in delirium, mania, protracted insomnia, or as antispasmodics in cholera, hysteria, etc. Remedies of this kind are classed under the name of anodynes, that is, drugs that take away pain by benumbing the sensory nerves. They may be applied to certain parts of the body only, without depriving the patient of consciousness. By anæsthetics are generally understood such agents as, affecting the brain directly, render it incapable of receiving outward impressions.[1]

That God has given such remedies to man, and that the latter may use them to relieve the ills of life, there can be no doubt. Nevertheless they may be abused. There is a limit which forbids their indiscriminate use under all circumstances and without measure. It cannot be man's principal object in life to seek immunity from suffering. The fact that it is quite impossible wholly to avoid pain whilst we are on earth, points to a law which implies its necessity to some extent for the conservation of a higher purpose. That higher purpose is the safety of the soul, which outlives the body; and the latter is but the instrument to aid the perfect attainment of absolute happiness, towards which we

[1] Anodynes are: opium, belladonna, hyoscyamus, and their alcoloids, chloroform, ether, cocaine, the last three of which are also anæsthetics. Certain plants, also intoxicants generally, and animal magnetism, may be classed, by reason of their effects, under the same category.

tend even when we shirk the ills of the present. If, then, freedom from bodily pain can be obtained only at the risk or loss of that higher life for which we are created, it would be unlawful to seek it or to procure it for others, because it is destructive instead of being auxiliary to the main purpose of our existence.

Theologians, discussing the obligations of persons in different states of life, with a view of aiding the priest in the direction of souls, lay down some general principles, which would show how far a physician may lawfully go in the use of remedies which serve mainly for the alleviation of pain. It is here that the priest's sphere begins, and where under varying circumstances he will be called upon to guide the patient or the physician, as the case may be, who leave to him the judgment of what is right or wrong according to the law of God. We have been at the sick-bed of Catholics who had learned the soothing effect of anodynes in painful and at the same time hopeless diseases. They could and would administer the magic drug to themselves, until it became apparent that they were literally committing suicide and at the same time depriving themselves by their own act of those powers of reason which insure in this case the valid reception of the last sacraments. Persuasion and reasoning will do little if indulgence in the use of these means has trespassed certain limits; and the responsibility of withholding the opiate rests with the doctor or the nurse and with the priest, who advises the conscience of either and attends the patient for his spiritual interests. A feeling of pity, very natural under the circumstances, may incline those who have care of the sick to administer the drug in order to reduce the evident torture to which he is subjected, and there are physicians who maintain that it is but an act of mercy to hasten the end of a person who is continually suffering, when he is sure to die.

The practical question thus brought before us is: What is the moral law regulating the use of anæsthetics?—Assum-

ing that the means employed under the name of anæsthetics are not in themselves unlawful, and hence exclude the methods of magnetists, spiritualists, and the like, we arrive at a proper answer to the above question by reference to certain fundamental principles accepted in morals. Every direct and intentional attempt against human life, on one's own authority, is sinful in the moral order. This proposition hardly needs any demonstration. Man is not the master of his own or another's life, which has been given him simply as a trust, and of the use of which he is to give account to a higher authority. Not only may he not destroy it, but he is bound to preserve it by the ordinary means which nature puts at his disposal. Hence we conclude that it is unlawful directly and intentionally to take or to shorten life, although it be attended with constant pain, and although recovery is morally impossible.[1] But the principles upon which this conclusion rests assume that the attempt to shorten life is not only not in self-defence and unauthorized, but direct and intentional.

Let us take the case of a patient who endures constantly the most excruciating pains. Nature and the moral law allow him relief when there is no violation of a superior right than that of freeing one's self from suffering. Against the latter we have here the right of preserving life. But we are not bound to use extraordinary means to preserve life, and the constant endurance of excessive pain would be an extraordinary means. Hence moralists limit the interpretation of the above principle by a second proposition: It is not always unlawful to hasten *indirectly* and for serious cause one's own death or that of another. St. Alphonsus holds that it is never allowable to shorten life notably, because that would be equivalent to taking life, and a considerable shortening of life when foreseen cannot be said to be unintentional or indirect.[2] Intense and continual pain, such as frequently exposes a pa-

[1] Lehmkuhl, Theol. mor., vol. I., n. 994.

[2] Cf. Lehmkuhl, Op. cit., vol. I., n. 571, 573.

tient to danger of committing mortal sin, would be considered a grave cause. Hence the use of opiates, although they deprive a sick person who suffers great pains for a time of consciousness, cannot be accounted sinful, even if we know and remotely foresee that it tends to shorten life; not so, however, when death is apparently close at hand, for in that case the danger of direct interference with life is proximate, and therefore everything to be avoided which will make it actual. On the other hand, the sufferings of the sick person will soon end, and we may not deprive him of the chances of meriting by their endurance for the sake of eternal life. But when death is remote, the shortening of life incidental to the use of opiates taken for weighty cause, such as the soothing of excessive pain, cannot be said to be sinful any more than the pursuit of many occupations or habits in life which are likely to diminish the ordinary chances of a long life, so long as this effect is not directly intended. But there is another phase of the question. Anodynes or anæsthetics, when too frequently used or taken in abnormal quantities, lead to effects which absolutely enforce restriction in their use upon moral grounds. We saw that a considerable shortening of life would render them illicit agents to dispel pain, inasmuch as death may be said to follow from them directly. Practitioners tell us that the consequences following the habitual use of these narcotics are frightful. They not only weaken the whole system but destroy the power of the nerves to withstand pain, and thus an ever increasing desire for their repeated application is aroused in the patient. Every organ of the body becomes deranged, and sleeplessness, loss of appetite, and impaired digestion follow. An attempt to deprive him of morphia, says Capellmann, is followed by chills, general pains, severe diarrhœas. The end is raving madness. The effects of cocaine, which has of late years been introduced, are even worse. It destroys both body and soul with fearful rapidity, by utterly debilitating the will to resist its use.[1]

[1] Cocainum et corpora et animos multo celerius et vehementius perdit ac destruit

These effects, which are often worse than death, make therefore even the moderate use of most anæsthetics a constant danger and proximate occasion of sin, for to deprive one's self or another permanently of the powers of reason and will is a grievous sin and an evil not to be outweighed by any temporal pain, no matter how great. To save the patient a few days of suffering, we expose his soul to eternal loss and endless pain. It is unreasonable and against the moral law. The use, therefore, of anæsthetics to diminish pain is never to be left to the discretion of the patient; and so far as it is in our power to prevent it, we are under obligation to do so. In face of the lasting danger, especially to the soul, which attends even their legitimate use, it should be discountenanced outside of painful and serious operations.

But may not a narcotic be given to a person who is near death, in order that his passage into eternity may be without struggle and pain, provided he have already received the last sacraments and been reconciled with God?—We incline to answer this question, with Lehmkuhl, in the negative. He says: "It is unlawful to give narcotics to a dying person which deprive him of the use of his reason, in order that he might not feel his pains *and die unconsciously*." If the patient be religiously prepared for death, there is every reason to believe that he will be willing to bear the pains of his remaining life and the last struggle with Christian resignation; and it is un-Christian to deprive him of the merit of these moments through a misplaced compassion. But if the sick man is not well prepared to meet his judge, this remnant of life is all the more important to him by allowing him the use of reason to make an act of sorrow with his last breath. When God gives that respite of life, it cannot be prudent for us to take it away deliberately. And even if the pains be such as to

quam morphium.—Hallucinationes, animi et perturbationes et infirmitates, mania persecutoria fere sine exceptione vitam horum hominum concludunt. Quare cupiditas cocaini multo difficilius curatur, quam morphii, etc. *Medicina Pastoralis*, Capellmann. Edit. II., 1890.

cause the danger of the sufferer committing grave sin, we must believe that the last moment will be important to him by cancelling it, with the assistance of God's grace, through the administration of the final absolution and the prayers of the dying which are breathed into his ear.[1] This is the purpose of the sacramental rites for the dying in the Catholic Church; to soothe the last moments of her faithful children is the happy privilege of the priest, and needs no hastening or artificial and hurtful means by the aid of drugs.

HYMNS OF THE LITTLE HOURS.

Thou art, O God, the life and light
Of all this wondrous world we see:
Its glow by day, its smile by night,
Are but reflections caught from Thee—
Where'r we turn Thy glories shine,
And all things fair and bright are Thine.

The modern poet gives us a good text for a brief notice of the ancient hymns of the "hours," which, constant as the stars in heaven,

Still quiring to the young-ey'd cherubim,

have indeed become, by their use in the Divine Office, "hymns of the ages." For in the familiar face of Nature the singer could see only the authentic lineaments of the divine countenance; and while taking the natural as his text, he

[1] Non licebit medico *moribundum*....usu rationis privare, ne ægrotus dolores sentiat atque *sine doloris conscientia decedat.* Nam si unquam in tali tempore necessarium est, ut homini servetur facultas merendi seseque cum Deo reconciliandi....Quare, si ægrotus nondum bene præparatus est ad mortem, talis medicorum industria omni vi impedienda est: Si autem bene præparatus est, et ex continuato rationis usu periculum graviter labendi oriatur, positive permitti quidem nequit ejusmodi medicorum praxis, silentio prætermitti utique potest. At si labendi periculum abest, nullo modo res silentio permittenda est generatim loquendo, quia occasio multum merendi ægroto subtrahitur.—Lehmk., Theol. mor., vol. I., n. 743, 3.

must read between its lines, and preach, not Nature, but the God of nature. His spiritual eye could therefore perceive obvious suggestiveness in the various physical phases of the *horæ*. *Jam lucis orto sidere* he sees, not merely the natural day, that wakens to new activity the birds of the air and the beasts of the field, but another day of grace, that should find the soul busy with work and worship, with praise and petition; and he prays God,

Ut in diurnis actibus
Nos servet a nocentibus.

So, in the genial brightness and quickening warmth of Terce he sees a figure of the love that brightens and quickens the soil of the soul:

Flammescat igne caritas,
Accendat ardor proximos.

Again, taking as text the flaming meridian splendors, he at once preaches the power of God

Splendore mane illuminans
Et ignibus meridiem,

and sees a figure of that heat of passion which can dry up in our soul the dews of grace, and prays God to take away such baneful warmth.

The lesson of None is, of course, the approaching evening of life; and he prays:

Largire lumen vespere
Quo vita nunquam decidat.

We have here only another part of the parallel between the natural and the supernatural which is sometimes even more pointedly drawn in the Ferial hymns; as, for instance, in matins of Fer. III.,

Consors paterni luminis
Lux ipse lucis et dies—

and that other in Lauds of Fer. II.,

Splendor paternæ gloriæ,
De luce lucem proferens,
Lux lucis et fons luminis,
Diem dies illuminans.

The parallel is, of course, an obvious one, and the figures are simple; and we shall err if we seek to base the merit of the hymns of the hours on any other beauty than that which, like the glory of the king's daughter, "is within." There is in them no attempt at "fine writing;" and there is evidently no straining after effect. The singer went up into the temple to pray. Of him might be aptly said what Trench says of St. Ambrose in his songs: "It is as though, building an altar to the living God, he would observe the Levitical precept, and rear it of unhewn stones, upon which no tool had been lifted." The hymns, then, are so many prayers; or rather, like the great 118th psalm, so many splendid litanies of supplication. Every line almost is a distinct prayer—not uttered at random, but with all the force of timeliness, of simplicity, of ejaculatory brevity and energy.

Criticism has not succeeded in definitely settling their authorship. They have been attributed generally to St. Ambrose. Still, although they possess the rugged strength and simplicity of the great bishop's muse, and a metre identical with that of his four hymns,[1] and similar cast of thought and expression, anything more than a *probable* authenticity can scarcely be conceded them. Schlosser, indeed, in his contents, puts them under the heading of "St. Ambrose"; but a more exact and rigid criticism would put them in the category of so-called Ambrosian hymns.[2]

It need hardly be a matter of very great concern that St. Ambrose should not with certainty be identified with their

[1] Deus Creator omnium, Æterne rerum conditor, Jam surgit hora tertia, Veni Redemptor gentium, are of undoubted authenticity.

[2] A large class of hymns, many of which were not ascribed to St. Ambrose, were loosely called *Ambrosiani* because of their close imitation of his peculiar hymnal style. We use the word here in its narrower sense, as indicating hymns that have for various reasons been ascribed to St. Ambrose. Duffield (p. 56) places these hymns of the "hours" in his category of "possible originals." "Von den vielen Hymnen, welche unter dem Namen des Ambrosius umgeboten werden,—Schlosser führt unter seinem Namen 39 an—lassen sich nur vier mit *historischer* Gewissheit als echt nachweisen."—Kayser: "Beiträge zur Geschichte, etc," Paderborn, p. 130.

authorship: enough for us that they are full of the strength and simplicity, the ardor and majesty of the great Bishop of Milan; that they have been thought worthy of association with his venerable name; that they bring us into daily fellowship with his spirit; that, though sung in far-off centuries, they are full of a present meaning and power, and can raise the soul in praise and petition to the Beauty "ever ancient, yet ever new."

In an exact translation of such hymns much modern poetic beauty can hardly be looked for. Prayer, rather than Poesy, was the aim of their composer: and so, a great part of the merit of any translation of them must be simplicity and exactness. We have tried to be faithful, therefore, almost to scrupulosity, and have rejected many figures of thought and diction which might have been agreeable to a modern poetical sense at the expense of exactness. The poems have been rendered almost line by line with the originals. We have included *Complin* in this paper, so as to have all the "familiar faces" together. Duffield classes it with a number of hymns of which he says:[1] "While these are often known to be mere paraphrases of Ambrose's own homilies, or imitations of his hymns, they are as frequently found to possess his spirit and almost the very forms of his verse."[2]

PRIME.

Jam lucis orto sidere,	The orb of morning mounts the sky:—
Deum precemur supplices,	Let us with humble voices pray
Ut in diurnis actibus	That God throughout our active day
Nos servet a nocentibus.	Guard us from perils lurking nigh:—
Linguam refrœnans temperet,	Bridling the tongue, lest horrid strife
Ne litis horror insonet:	Affright the calmness of the air:
Visum fovendo contegat,	Veiling the sight with tender care
Ne vanitates hauriat.	From all the vanities of life

[1] Latin Hymns, p. 57.

[2] For a good commentary on the Hymns of the Little Hours, see Bacquez: The Divine Office, pp. 465–519.

Sint pura cordis intima,
Absistat et vecordia:
Carnis terat superbiam
Potus cibique parcitas:

Ut cum dies abscesserit,
Noctemque sors reduxerit,
Mundi per abstinentiam
Ipsi canamus gloriam.

Deo Patri sit gloria
Ejusque soli Filio
Cum Spiritu Paraclito
Nunc et per omne sæculum. Amen.

Be pure, O temple of the heart,
And foolish dreamings, fade away:
And all the pride of our poor clay
In frugal sustenance depart.

That when the dying day shall fling
Its darkling mantle o'er the scene,
We may, by abstinence made clean,
To God our joyful praises sing.

To God the Father glory be,
And to His Son in measure meet,
And to the Spirit Paraclete,
Now and through all eternity. Amen.

TERCE.

Nunc Sancte nobis Spiritus,
Unum Patri cum Filio,
Dignare promptus ingeri
Nostro refusus pectori.

Os, lingua, mens, sensus, vigor,
Confessionem personent:
Flammescat igne caritas,
Accendat ardor proximos.

Præsta, Pater piissime
Patrique compar Unice,
Cum Spiritu Paraclito,
Regnans per omne sæculum.
Amen.

O Holy Spirit who art one
With God the Father and the Son,
Come now in haste from heaven above
And fill our waiting hearts with love.

Let mouth and tongue, let strength and mind
Proclaim Thy praises to mankind:
Let love, aflame within each heart,
A kindred flame to all impart.

So, loving Father, let it be,
And Son of equal Deity;
And Holy Spirit Paraclete,
Whose reign the endless ages greet.
Amen.

SEXT.

Rector potens, verax Deus,
Qui temperas rerum vices,
Splendore mane illuminas
Et ignibus meridiem:

Extingue flammas litium,
Aufer calorem noxium,
Confer salutem corporum
Veramque pacem cordium.

O potent ruler, truthful God,
Who rulest all with tempering rod,
Flooding the morn with splendors bright,
Kindling the morn with fires of light:

Quench Thou the flames of every strife,
And cool the heart with passion rife;
And to the body health impart,
And peace surpassing to the heart.

Præsta, Pater piissime
Patrique compar Unice
Cum Spiritu Paraclito
Regnans per omne sæculum.
Amen.

So, loving Father, let it be,
And Son of equal Deity,
And Holy Spirit Paraclete,
Whose reign the endless ages greet.
Amen.

NONE.

Rerum Deus tenax vigor,
Immotus in te permanens,
Lucis diurnæ tempora
Successibus determinans:

O God, whose power unmoved the whole
Of nature's vastness doth control,
Kindling at morn the torch of light,
To flame at noon, to fade at night:

Largire lumen vespere,
Quo vita nusquam decidat,
Sed præmium mortis sacræ
Perennis instet gloria.

Grant us Thy light when comes the eve;
O ne'er our life in darkness leave,
But let a holy death's reward
Be endless glory in the Lord.

Præsta, Pater piissime
Patrique compar Unice
Cum Spiritu Paraclito
Regnans per omne sæculum. Amen.

So, loving Father, may it be,
And Son of equal Deity,
And Holy Spirit Paraclete,
Whose reign the endless ages greet.
Amen.

COMPLIN.

Te lucis ante terminum,
Rerum Creator poscimus,
Ut pro tua clementia
Sis præsul et custodia.

Before the ending of the light,
O nature's God, we ask of Thee
That for Thy tender clemency
Thou be our guard and guide this night.

Procul recedant somnia
Et noctium phantasmata,
Hostemque nostrum comprime,
Ne polluantur corpora.

All dreams and phantoms drive afar,
And, binding fast our enemy,
Keep us in peace and purity,
Till shines again the morning star.

Præsta, Pater piissime
Patrique compar Unice
Cum Spiritu Paraclito
Regnans per omne sæculum.
Amen.

So, loving Father, let it be,
And Son of equal Deity,
And Holy Spirit Paraclete,
Whose reign the endless ages greet.
Amen.

H. T. HENRY.

MATERIA EXAMINIS PRO BACCALAUREATU IN S. THEOLOGIA, IN UNIVERSITATE CATHOLICA AMERICÆ.

ANNO 1890–'91.

OBSERVATIONES PRÆVIÆ.

1. Juxta "Constitutiones Facultatis Theologicæ," c. iv., n. vii., "qui post prævium cursum theologicum alibi laudabiliter factum studia superiora in Lyceo aggrediuntur, *adhibitis attestationibus cursus cum profectu expleti*, initio admitti possunt ad certandum pro Baccalaureatu."

Nulli igitur patebit aditus ad hunc gradum nisi, post cursum philosophicum, per tres saltem annos scientiarum sacrarum studio incubuerit.

2. Examen *initio anni scholastici* locum habebit, fietque *tum scripto tum oretenus*. In *scripto* scilicet respondendum est quæstionibus nonnullis ex diversis disciplinis theologicis omnibus simul candidatis proponendis. Uniuscujusque deinde examen *orale per horæ spatium* durabit. In utroque *latino sermone* utendum est in iis saltem materiis, quæ in Seminariis latine tradi solent.

3. Ut theologiæ universæ repetitio præparatoria candidatis quam utilissima evadat, quæstiones præcipuas paullo accuratius indicandas esse censuimus: quarum delectus in singulis disciplinis ea ratione habitus fuit, ut examinandi solidæ scientiæ specimen exhibere possint ac debeant, quin tamen materiarum mole nimis graventur.

MATERIA EXAMINIS.

I. SCRIPTURA SACRA.

1. Explicetur et probetur notio *inspirationis*.
2. *Canon* S. Scripturæ.

3. Quinam distinguuntur sacri textus *varii sensus?*

4. Quæ sunt Scripturæ præcipuæ *versiones?*

5. Vindicetur authentia *vulgatæ.*

6. Explanetur unus liber Veteris Testamenti, candidati arbitrio seligendus; probando, scil., ejus authentiam dando analysim, textum explicando.

7. Item de uno ex Evangeliis, vel aliqua ex majoribus Epistolis Apostolicis.

II. LINGUA HEBRAICA.

Elementa linguæ; interpretatio duorum capitum V. T.

III. THEOLOGIA DOGMATICA.

Fundamentalis et specialis.

1. Quid revelatio? demonstra eius possibilitatem, necessitatem moralem quoad veritates religionis naturalis, nec non absolutam quoad veritates supernaturales, et in specie quoad mysteria.

2. Quænam sunt revelationis criteria? Proba miraculorum possibilitatem et cognoscibilitatem.

3. Proba divinam Christi missionem et vaticiniis et miraculis.

4. Quid et quotuplex regula fidei? Proba Sacram Scripturam non esse unicum organon propagandæ et conservandæ revelationis, sed ut tale Christum instituisse magisterium vivum et infallibile.

5. Soli Ecclesiæ Catholicæ veræ Ecclesiæ Christi notas competere probetur.

6. Proba Ecclesiam Catholicam esse societatem perfectam et necessariam, et explica illud: extra Ecclesiam nulla salus.

7. Quid primatus? Quemnam asseruerunt Gallicani? Proba primatum jurisdictionis in universam Ecclesiam a Christo Domino Beato Petro promissum et collatum fuisse.

8. Solus Romanus Pontifex est legitimus Petri successor

in primatu; ipsius ex cathedra loquentis judicia sunt ex se irreformabilia.

9. Explicetur et probetur doctrina Concilii Vaticani de Deo naturali rationis lumine cognoscibili.

10. Dei scientia quomodo dividitur? Proba eam extendi ad futura libera tum absoluta tum conditionata.

11. Quid prædestinatio? de ea quid docuerunt Calvinistæ, Jansenistæ? quid docent Catholici? Proba Deum voluntate antecedente vera et sincera velle omnes homines salvos fieri, etiam infantes ante baptismum susceptum vita functos.

12. Probetur mysterium SS. Trinitatis ex S. Scriptura.

13. Spiritus Sancti a Patre Filioque processio.

14. Probetur ex revelatione creatio mundi ex nihilo.

15. Explicentur conceptus naturæ, naturalis, supernaturalis, præternaturalis.

16. Quid peccatum originale? Proba ejus existentiam ex Rom. v.

17. Immaculata Conceptio et perpetua Virginitas Beatissimæ Deiparæ.

18. Jesus Christus verus Deus et verus homo.

19. Quid natura? quid hypostasis? quid persona? Vindica unionem hypostaticam contra Nestorianos et Adoptianos.

20. Quid cultus latriæ, hyperduliæ, duliæ? Vindica cultum Sacratissimi Cordis Jesu.

21. Quid gratia? quomodo dividitur? Proba gratiam supernaturalem actualem esse necessariam ad omnes actus salutares.

22. De gratiæ efficacia quid censuere Protestantes? quid Baiani? quid Jansenistæ? eam quomodo explicant scholæ Catholicæ.

23. Enumera et explica effectus formales justificationis.

24. Quid sacramentum? de sacramentis quid docent Protestantes, quid Catholici? Proba ea conferre gratiam ex opere operato.

25. Proba realem Christi præsentiam in Eucharistia ex verbis promissionis et institutionis.

26. Explica et proba transsubstantiationem.

27. Proba S. Missæ celebratione offerri verum et proprium sacrificium.

28. Proba necessitatem confessionis sacramentalis.

29. Quid matrimonium Christianum? quænam Ecclesiæ potestas in statuendis impedimentis? quinam hujus sacramenti minister? Proba matrimonii indissolubilitatem.

30. Proba immediatam visionem Dei ut in se est, nobis tanquam ultimum finem in revelatione propositam ac promissam esse.

IV. THEOLOGIA MORALIS.

1. Quid voluntarium.—Quænam præcipuæ voluntarii species.—Qua ratione voluntario obstant ignorantia, concupiscentia, metus, violentia.

2. Quid moralitas actuum humanorum.—Quomodo derivatur moralitas ab objecto, fine et circumstantiis.

3. Quid conscientia: quid conscienta vera et erronea, certa et dubia.—Quomodo in casu dubii (positivi vel negativi) de obligationis objectivæ existentia efformanda sit conscientia recta.

4. Quid peccatum: quid peccatum mortale, quid veniale —Unde petitur distinctio specifica peccatorum.

5. Quid infidelitas, apostasia, hæresis.—Quænam ex jure hodierno pœnæ ecclesiasticæ in apostatas et hæreticos latæ.

6. Quid eleemosyna: qualis et quanta obligatio eleemosynam largiendi, quandonam urget ista obligatio.

7. Quid scandalum, quotuplex distinguitur, quale et quantum peccatum.

8. Quid cooperatio: quænam præcipuæ cooperationis formæ: quandonam illicita aut licita cooperatio ad malum.

9. In quo consistit peccatum sacrilegii: explicetur distinctio sacrilegii in personale, locale, reale.

10. In quo consistit peccatum simoniæ: explicetur distinctio simoniæ in mentalem, conventionalem, realem, confidentialem.—Quibus pœnis jure hodierno punitur simonia.

11. Juramenti essentia: conditiones necessariæ ad ejus liceitatem: juramenti promissorii obligatio.

12. Voti essentia: requisita ad ejus validitatem. Potestas irritandi vota uxoris, filiorum, religiosorum, competens marito, patri, prelato.—Dispensatio in voto, ejusque commutatio.

13. Festorum observantia; legis origo; opera præstanda, omittenda.

14. Suicidium: quo jure prohibitum: pœnæ ecclesiasticæ in hujus criminis reos.

15. Occisio injusti aggressoris: an licita: sub quibusnam conditionibus.

16. Intrinseca malitia duellii: pœnæ ecclesiasticæ in duellantes latæ.

17. Malitia mendacii: an et quousque licitus usus restrictionum mentalium.

18. Juris notio et præcipuæ species.

19. Justitiæ definitio et distinctio in commutativam, legalem et distributivam.

20. Liceitas appropriationis individualis bonorum externorum etiam immobilium.

21. Proprietatis legitimæ tituli tum primitivi tum derivati: occupatio et labor, successio, præscriptio et contractus.

22. Conditiones occupationis.

23. Conditiones successionis.

24. Conditiones præscriptionis.

25. Conditiones contractus.

26. Definitio injuriæ.

27. Natura furti et gravitas materiæ in furto.

28. Qua restitutionis obligatione tenetur possessor rei alienæ, *a*, si fuerit bonæ fidei, *b*, si fuerit malæ fidei, *c*, si fuerit fidei dubiæ.

29. Quis dicitur injustus damnificator: quandonam damnificator tenetur damnum a se causatum reparare.

30. An licitum est lucrum perceptum ex mutuo: quandonam.

31. Contritio et attritio quatenus requiruntur et sufficiunt ad remissionem peccatorum tum in sacramento pœnitentiæ tum extra sacramentum.

32. Quid importat confessionis integritas.

33. Approbatio et jurisdictio necessaria in ministro pœnitentiæ.

34. Qua ratione confessarius generatim debeat se gerere cum recidivis et consuetudinariis.

35. Exponuntur impedimenta *vis et metus, consanguinitatis, voti et ordinis, criminis, disparitatis cultus.*

V.—JUS CANONICUM.

De Personis: de Rebus: de Judiciis. (Ex tribus his partibus *unam* pro lubitu eligere poterit).

VI.—HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA.

Historiam ecclesiasticam, in ordine ad examen pro Baccalaureatu, distinguimus in *quatuor partes: ex his candidatus unusquisque unam eliget, in qua sola interrogabitur, et quidem determinatis quæstionibus quæ sequuntur.*

PARS PRIMA.

A PRÆDICATIONE APOSTOLICA USQUE AD EXCIDIUM IMPERII OCCIDENTALIS.

1. Romanus S. Petri episcopatus.—Persecutio Neronis.

2. S. Clemens.—Persecutio Domitiani.

3. Persecutio Trajani—Plinii epistola.—S. Ignatius.

4. S. Victor.—Controversia de Paschate.

5. Patres Apostolici.

6. Septimii Severi persecutio.—S. Irenæus.

7. S. Zephyrinus et S. Callistus.—S. Hippolytus.—Philosophoumena.

8. Clemens Alexandrinus et Origenes, Tertullianus.

9. Decii persecutio.—SS. Cornelius et Stephanus.—S. Cyprianus.

10. Apologetæ.

11. Fidei propagatio prioribus sæculis.

12. Gnostici, Montanistæ, Novatiani, Manichæi.

13. Persecutio Diocletiani.—Conversio Constantini.

14. Ariana hæresis.—Concilium Nicænum.

15. Semi-arianismus.—Liberius—Concilia Sardicense, Ariminense, Seleuciense.—Formulæ Sirmienses.—Arianismi decrementa, ejus propagatio apud Gothos aliosque populos barbaros.

16. Pelagius.—Concilia Africana.

17. Nestorius.—Concilium Ephesinum.

18. Eutyches.—Concilium Chalcedonense.—Latrocinium Ephesinum.

19. Magni Pontifices sæculi IV et V.—Ecclesiæ Patres præcipui.—Doctores.—Liturgiæ.

20. Conversio Hibernorum per S. Patricium.

PARS SECUNDA.

AB EXCIDIO IMPERII OCCIDENTALIS USQUE AD INNOCENTIUM III.

1. Conversio Clodovæi, Francorum regis.

2. S. Benedictus, Monachorum legislator.—S. Columbanus.

3. Visigothorum conversio.

4. Tria Capitula.—Conc. Constantinopolitanum II.

5. S. Gregorius Magnus.

6. Anglorum conversio per S. Augustinum.

7. Islamismus, ejus character et propagatio.

8. Monotheletismus.—Concilium Œcumenicum VI.—Honorius.

9. Synodi Toletanæ.—Magni Scriptores Hispani.—Hispaniæ occupatio per Mauros.

10. Iconoclastæ.—Conc. Nicænum II.—Synodus Franco-Fordiensis.

11. S. Bonifacius.

12. Donatio Pipini.—Civilis principatus RR. Pontificum.

13. Carolus Magnus.—Sanctum Imperium Romanum: ejus character.

14. Paschasius Radbertus et Godescalchus.

15. Decretales Pseudo-Isidorii.

16. S. Nicolaus I.—SS. Cyrillus et Methodius.—Slavorum conversio.

17. Photius.—Schisma.—Concilium Œcum. VIII.

18. Status Ecclesiæ saeculo X.—Indoles Imperii sub-Othone Magno.

19. Labes Ecclesiæ saec. XI: Clerogamia, Simonia, Investituræ.

20. S. Gregorius VII.—Berengarius.

21. Bella Cruciata.

22. S. Bernardus.—S. Norbertus.—Abælardus.—Petrus Lombardus.

23. S. Thomas Cantuariensis.

24. Conc. Lateranense III.

PARS TERTIA.

AB INNOCENTIO III USQUE AD REFORMATIONEM.

1. Innocentius III.

2. SS. Franciscus et Dominicus: Ordines mendicantes.

3. Concilium Later. IV.

4. Albigenses et Waldenses.—Tribunal Inquisitionis.

5 Gregorius IX et Fridericus II.

6. Concilium Lugdunense I.

7. Theologia scholastica: B. Albertus Magnus, Alex. Alensis, S. Thomas, S. Bonaventura, Scotus.

8. Concilium Lugdunense II.

9. Dissidia Franciscanorum.

10. Bonifacius VIII et Philippus Pulcher.

11. Clemens V.—Papæ Avenionenses.

12. Concilium Viennense.—Templarii.

13. Joannes XXII et Ludovicus Bavarus.—Minoritæ.

14. Schisma Occidentale: Pontifices, Concilia, Scriptores.

15. Wiccleffitarum et Hussitarum hæresis.

16. Concilium Florentinum.—Græcorum unio.

17. Excidium Imperii Orientalis.

18. Inventio artis typographicæ.

19. Renovatio studiorum litterarum.
20. Inventio Americæ.
21. Pontifices Romani: Pius II, Nicolaus V, Innocentius VIII, Alexander VI, Julius II, Leo X.
22. Concilium Lateranense V.

PARS QUARTA.

A REFORMATIONE USQUE AD CONCILIUM VATICANUM.

1. Lutherus, Zvinglius, Calvinus.
2. Adrianus VI, Clemens VII, Paulus III.
3. Carolus V. Imperator.
4. Henricus VIII.—Schisma Anglicanum.
5. Concilium Tridentinum.
6. S. Ignatius et Societas Jesu.—Institutio Clericorum Regularium.
7. S. Carolus Borromæus.
8. S. Pius V.—Bellum Turcarum.—Victoria.
9. S. Franciscus Xaverius.
10. S. Teresia.
11. S. Philippus Nerius.
12. Magni theologi sæculi XVI.—Baronius.
13. S. Franciscus Salesius.
14. Bellum triginta annorum in Germania.—Pax Westphalica.
15. Baius.—Jansenius.—Arnaldus.—Porturegienses.
16. S. Vincentius a Paulo.
17. Lites Ludovici XIV. cum RR. Pontificibus. Declaratio Cleri Gallicani anni 1682.
18. Magni theologi sæculi XVII.—Bollandistæ.—Maurini.
19. Quesnellus.—Bulla Unigenitus.
20. Ritus Sinenses et Malabarici.
21. Rationalistæ in Anglia et in Gallia.—Encyclopedia.
22. Febronius et Josephismus.
23. Suppressio Societatis Jesu.
24. Revolutio Gallicana.

25. Pontifices sæculi XIX: Pius VII, Leo XII, Pius VIII, Gregorius XVI.

26. Perturbatio Italica.

27. Pius IX.—Concilium Vaticanum.

28. Hierarchiæ Americanæ institutio.—Ejus extensio.—Concilia Plenaria.

TITULAR FEASTS IN SEPTEMBER.

I. NATIVITY OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN (SEPTEMBER 8).

(*Twenty-eight Churches in* 1888.)

Sept. 8, Fer. 2. *Alb.* Nativitas B. M. V. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Nihil fit de S. Adriano. Reliq. ut in Calend. hodie et per totam Oct.

II. EXALTATION OF THE H. CROSS, (SEPTEMBER 14).

(*This feast is the titular only of Churches dedicated to the Exaltation of the H. Cross. Those dedicated to the H. Cross simply have their titular feast on the 3d of May, festival of the Invention of the H. Cross.*)

Sept. 13, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. ut in Calend sine com. Oct.

14, Dom. *Rub.* Exaltat. SS. Crucis D. N. J. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. sine com. Oct. Nativ. Vesp. ut in Calend.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Per tot. Oct. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. in qua Cr. et Præf. Cruc. (except. Oct. Nativ.) et omiss. Suffr. et Prec. Fer. 3.

21, De die Octava ob fest. S. Matthæi fit ut simplex et commemoratur in 1. Vesp. Laud. Miss. et 2. Vesp. ante alias commemorationes.

III. HOLY NAME OF MARY (SEPTEMBER 14).

(*Eight Churches in* 1888.)

Festum Exaltationis S. Crucis hoc anno celebrandum 25. Sept. Pro Clero Romano 3. Oct.

Sept. 13, Vesp. de seq. com. Dom. tant. Per tot. Oct. *Jesu, tibi sit gloria.*

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

14, Dom. *Alb.* Fest. SS. Nomin. Mariæ Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. ad 25. Sept. cum 9. Lect. de hom. et com. Dom. in Laud. et Miss. Evgl. Dom. in fine. In 2. Vesp. com. Dom. et S. Nicomedis tant.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

15, Fer. 2. *Alb.* Octav. Nativ. B. M. V. pro utroq. Clero ut in Calend. sine com. Oct. S. Nominis.

Per reliq. Octav. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. in qua Cr. et Præf. B. M. V. et omiss. suffr. et Prec. Fer. 3.

21, De die Octava ob fest. S. Matth. fit ut simplex et commemoratur in 1. Vesp. Laud. Miss. et 2. Vesp. ante alias commemorationes.

IV. SS. CORNELIUS AND CYPRIAN (SEPTEMBER 16).

(*One Church in* 1888.)

Sept. 15, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. sine ulla com.

16, Fer. 3. *Rub.* SS. Cornelii et Cyprian. Mart. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Fratres, debitores.* Reliq. ut in Breviar. et Missal. sine lect. et com. SS. Mart. Cr. In 2. Vesp. com seq.—hoc anno omittit. Initium libri Tobiæ.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Infr. Oct. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. (except. Fest. S. Matth.) et Cr.

Fest. S. Lini perpet. transferend. in 25 Sept. et proinde Fest. SS. Nomin. Mariæ hoc anno celebrand. 3. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, Fest. S. Lini figend. 3. Oct. et Fest. SS. Nomin. hoc anno transferend. in 21. Oct.

23, Fer. 3. *Rub.* Octava SS. Cornel. et Cypr. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Delectat* vel ut in festo. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Dominus Noster* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Virg. in Laud. et Miss. fest. Vesp. de seq. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

V. ST. CYPRIAN (SEPTEMBER 16).

(*Two Churches in* 1888.)

Fest. S. Cornel. perpetuo figend. 25. Sept. et Fest. S. Nomin.

Mariæ hoc anno celebrand. 7. Oct. Pro Clero Romano Fest. S. Cornel. sub ritu semid. figend. 3. Oct. et Fest. Nomin. Mar. hoc anno celebrand. 22 Oct.

Sept. 15, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. or. *Infirmitatem* sine ulla com. neque cras.

16, Fer. 3. *Rub.* S. Cyprian. Ep. Mart. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Off. un. Mart. Pontif. et pr. loc. Lectt. 1. Noct. *A Mileto* 2. Noct. 4 et 5. pr. 6. de commun. *Triumphalis* 3. Noct. de commun. 1. loc. Miss. *Statuit* in qua Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. hoc anno omittit. Init. libri Tobiæ.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Infr. Oct. observa quod in Octava præcedenti.

Fest. S. Lini perpetuo transferend. in 26. Sept. et pro Clero Romano in 21. Oct.

23, Fer. 3. *Rub.* Octava S. Cyprian. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Tempus* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Sumptus* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Virg. in Laud. et Miss. fest. Vesp. de seq. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

VI. ST. MATTHEW (SEPTEMBER 21).

(*Twenty-eight Churches in* 1888.)

Sept. 20, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. com. Dom. tant.

21, Dom. *Rub.* S. Matthæi Ap. et Evg. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. In 2. Vesp. com. Dom. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Cr. et Præf. Apost. nisi ubi propria habetur per tot. Oct.

Pro utroq. Clero Fer. 2, 3, 4, 5, (6 pro Clero Romano et) Sabb. ut in Calend. ritu infr. oct. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss.

26, Fer. 6. *Rub.* de die 6. infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 1. Noct. Incip. Lib. Esther. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Et quamvis* (de Evglist.) vel ex Breviar. *Sancta*. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. pr. vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. (ex duab. fit una) et com. SS. Mart. in Laud. et Miss. fest. 3. or. *Concede*. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. Oct.

Festum Sept. Dolor. transferend. in 12. Oct., pro Clero Romano in 26. Oct., et fest. S. Evarist. celebrand. die sequenti. Fest. vero S. Wencesl. pro utroq. Clero perpetuo transferend. in

3. Oct. et fest. SS. Nomin. Mariæ pro Clero Romano hoc anno celebrand. 22. Oct.

27, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. com. Dom. et præc.

28, Dom. *Rub.* Octava S. Matth. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octvar. *Quatuor* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. pr. vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. de hom. et com. Dom. in Laud. et Miss. fest. Evgl. Dom. in fine Vesp. de seq. com. præc. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

VII. FEAST OF THE SEVEN DOLORS (SEPTEMBER 21).

(*Forty-eight Churches in* 1888, *among which the Cathedral of Natchez.*)

Festum S. Matth. transferend. in 26. Sept., pro Clero Romano in 3. Oct., et fest. SS. Nominis. Mariæ ulterius transferend. in 21. Oct.

Sept. 20, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. com. Dom. tant.—Doxolog. pr. et Præf. *Et te in transfixione* per tot. Oct. except. festis de Mercede et SS. Nominis.

21, Dom. *Alb.* Fest. Sept. Dolor. B. M. V. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. 28. Sept. cum com. Dom. tant. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Fer. 2, 3, 4, 5, (6. pro Clero Romano) et Sabb. ut in Calend. ritu infr. oct. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. exceptis festis B. M. V. fer. 4. et 5.

25, Vesp. de seq. com. præc. tant.

26, Fer. 6. *Rub.* S. Matth. Ap. et Evang. (fuit 21. Sept.) Dupl. 2. cl. Off. Ap. ut indicat. 21. Sept. 9. Lect. et com. SS. Mart. tant. in Laud. et Miss. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. tant.

27, De S. Wenceslao hoc anno fit ut simplex. Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) com. Dom. S. Wenceslai et præc.

28, Dom. *Alb.* Octava fest. Sept. Dolor. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. (Lectt. special concess. Congr. SS. Redempt. pro 2. et 3. Noct.) 2. et 3. Noct. ut in fest. 9. Lect. de hom. et com. Dom. et S. Wencesl. in Laud. et Miss. fest. Vesp. de seq. com. præc. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

VIII. ST. THOMAS A VILLANOVA (SEPTEMBER 22).

(*Three Churches in* 1888.)

Sept. 21, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. m. t. v. com. præc. tant.

22, Fer. 2. *Alb.* S. Thomæ a Villanova Ep. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Fidelis Sermo.* 2. et 3. Noct. et Miss. ut in Calend. Nulla com. Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra.

23, S. Lini Semid. ut in Calend. Lectt. 1. Noct. Incip. Lib. Judith. ex Domin. præc. Com. Oct. et S. Virg. in Laud. et Miss. Omitt. Suffr. et Prec. et or. *A cunctis.* Cr. Vesp. de seq. com. præc. et Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra.

Fer. 4. 5. (6. pro Clero Romano) Sabb. et Dom. ut in Calend. ritu infr. oct. pro utroq. Clero cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. in qua Cr.

26, Fer. 6. *Alb.* de die 5. infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 1. Noct. Incip. Lib. Esther. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Et homines* vel ex Breviar. *Ad sancti.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Divisio* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. (ex duab. fit una) et com. SS. Mart. in Laud. et Miss. fest. in qua 3. or. *Concede* et Cr. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. Oct. Omitt. Suffr. Prec. et orat. commun.

De die Octava pro utroq. Cler. fit ut simplex ob fest. S. Mich. Com. Oct. in 1. Vesp. Laud. Miss. et 2. Vesp.

IX. ST. MAURICE (SEPTEMBER 22).

(*Five Churches in* 1888.)

Si S. Mauritius solus sit patronus, nihil fit de ejus sociis. Fest. S. Thom. a Villan. permanent. figend. 26. Sept.—Pro Clero Romano 3. Oct. et Fest. SS. Nomin. Mariæ hoc anno celebrand. 21. Oct.

Sept. 21, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. (de commun. unius Mart.) com. præc. tant.

22, Fer. 2. *Rub.* S. Mauritii Mart. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. *A Mileto* 2. Noct. 1. pr. 2. et 3. et 3. Noct. de commun. 1. loc. Miss. *In virtute* Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra.

23, S. Lini. pro utroq. Clero ut infr. oct. S. Thomæ, supra.

Fer. 4. 5. (6. pro Clero Romano) Sabb. et Dom. ut in Calend. ritu infr. oct. pro utroq. Clero cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. in qua Cr.

25, In. 2. Vesp. com. seq. in pr. loc. Oct. et SS. Mart.

26, Fer. 6. *Alb.* S. Thom. a Villanova Ep. C. (fix. ex 22. Sept.) Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. Incip. Lib. Esther. Reliq. ut in Calend. ad 22. Sept. cum com. Oct. et SS. Mart. de quib. 9. Lect. (ex duab. fit una) in Laud. et Miss. in qua. Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et Oct.

De die Octava pro utroq. Clero fit ut simplex ob fest. S. Mich. Com. Oct. in 1. Vesp. Laud. Miss. et 2. Vesp.

X. OUR LADY OF MERCY (SEPTEMBER 24).

(*Ten Churches in* 1888.)

Sept. 23, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.—*Jesu, tibi sit gloria* per tot. Oct. except. Fest. Sept. Dolor.

24, Fer. 4. *Alb.* Fest. B. M. V. de Mercede Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. In 2. Vesp. nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

25, Nihil fit de Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr.

26, Fer. 6. de die 3. infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 1. Noct. Incip. Lib. Esther. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Novum* vel ex Breviar. *Dei Filius* 3. Noct. ut in fest. 9. Lect. (ex duab. fit una) et com. SS. Mart. in Laud. et Miss. fest. in qua 3. or. de Spiritu S. Cr. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.

Sabb. et Fer. 3. pro. utroq. Clero ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. Dom. vero et Fer. 2. nihil de Oct.

30, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. a cap. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) com. præc. et S. Remig.—Fest. S. Gregor. pro Clero Romano permanent. mutand. in 3. Oct. et Fest. SS. Nomin. Mariæ hoc anno celebrand. 21. Oct.

Oct. 1, Fer. 4. *Alb.* Octava B. M. V. de Mercede Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. Incip. Lib. I. Machab. 2. ex Octavar. *Fuit vir* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Remig. in Laud. et Miss. fest. Vesp. de seq. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

XI. ST. WENCESLAS (SEPTEMBER 28).

(*Twenty-six Churches in* 1888.)

Fest. Sept. Dolor. hoc anno transferend. in 12. Oct. Pro Clero Romano, in 26. Oct., unde fest. S. Evarist. transferend. in diem sequent.

Sept. 27, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. com. Dom. tant.

28, Dom. *Rub.* S. Wenceslai Reg. M. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. *A Mileto.* Reliq. ut in Breviar. et Miss. 9. Lect. de hom. et com. Dom. in Laud. et Miss. in qua Cr. et ult. Evgl. Dom. In. 2. Vesp. com. seq. et Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

29, Nihil de Octava.

Fer. 3. 4. 5. (6. pro Clero Romano) et Sabb. pro utroq. Clero ut in Calend. ritu infr. Oct. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. in qua Cr.

Oct. 3, Fer. 6. *Rub.* de die 6. infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Ut quid* vel ex Breviar. *Triumphalis* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *O beatum* (un. M. Pont.) vel ut in fest. Miss. fest. 2. or. *Concede* 3. Eccles. vel. pro Papa. Cr. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

De die Octava ob fest. SS. Rosarii hoc anno fit ut simplex pro utroq. Clero. et commemor. in 1. Vesp. Laud. Miss. et 2. Vesp.

XII. ST. MICHAEL AND HOLY ANGELS (SEPTEMBER 29).

(*One hundred and eighty-one Churches, among which the Cathedral of Springfield and the Pro-cathedral of Sioux-Falls, reported as dedicated to St. Michael, and nineteen to the Holy Angels, whose Titular feast is also celebrated on the 29th of September.*)

Sept. 28, Pro utroq. Clero. Vesp. de seq. sine com.

29, Fer. 2. *Alb.* Dedic. S. Mich. Archang. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

Fer. 3. 4. 5. (6. pro Clero Romano) Sabb. et Dom. pro utroq. Clero ut in Calend. ritu infr. oct. cum com. Oct. (except. Dom.) in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. in qua Cr.

Oct. 3, Fer. 6. *Alb.* de die 5. infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. pr. vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. pr. vel ut in fest. Miss. fest. 2. or. *Concede* 3. Eccles. vel pro Papa. Cr. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

Fest. S. Brunon. perpetuo figend. 7. Oct. et pro Clero Romano 12. Oct., ubi de eo hoc anno fiet ut simplex.

6, Fer. 2. *Alb.* Octava S. Michael. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. et 3. Noct. ex Octavar. pr. vel ut in festo Miss. fest. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. S. Marci et SS. Mart.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et SS. Mart.

7, Fer. 3. *Alb.* S. Brunonis Cr. Dupl. (fix. ex heri) ut in Calend. ad 6. Oct. cum 9. Lect. et com. S. Marc. et SS. Mart. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc.

XIII. ST. JEROME (SEMPTEBER 30).

(*Fourteen Churches in* 1888.)

Sept. 29, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. com. præc.

30, Fer. 3. *Alb.* S. Hieronym. Presb. C. D. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend.

Pro Clero Romano, idem. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et S. Remig.

Fer. 4. 5. (6. pro Clero Romano) Sabb. Dom. et Fer. 2. pro utroq. Clero ut in Calend. ritu infr. Oct. cum com. (except. Dom.) Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. in qua Cr.

Oct. 3, Fer. 6. *Alb.* de die 4. infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Non habetis* vel ex Breviar. *Qui post Orionas.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Attendite* vel ut in fest. Miss. fest. 2. or. *Concede* 3. Eccles. vel. pro Papa. Cr. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

6, Vesp. a cap. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) com. præc. S. Marc. et SS. Mart.

Pro Clero Romano, Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et SS. Mart. Fest. S. Marc. perpet. figend. 12. Oct., ubi de eo hoc anno fiet ut simplex.

7, Fer. 3. *Alb.* Octava. S. Hieron. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Sollicitissime* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Luceat* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Marc.

et SS. Mart. in Laud. et Miss. fest. Cr. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. supra.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Other Titulars this month, with each one church reported in 1888, are St. Rosalia, Virgo, September 4th; St. Januarius, Martyr, September 19th; and the SS. Cosmas and Damian, Martyres, September 27th; but not to make this article too long, we refer the ecclesiastics who may have them as Titulars to the general rules for the making of octaves.

H. GABRIELS.

CONFERENCE.

Scapular of Mt. Carmel.

Qu. Is the imposition of the Scapular of Mt. Carmel valid if one uses the old formula because he has not at hand the new one, or for other reasons, as neglect, etc. ?

Resp. According to several decisions of the S. Congregation of Rites, any form which substantially expresses the acts of blessing and investing is sufficient for the valid reception of the scapular. Cf. *Am. Eccl. Review*, vol. I., pag. 232.

Qu. Must the Scapular be worn next to the skin ?

Resp. No.—"An parvi habitus seu scapularia sint necessario immediate super corpus deferendi, ita ut illud physice tangant, vel an super vestes retineri possint?" *Negative* ad primam partem, *affirmative* ad secundam. S. R. C. die 26 Julii, 1855.

Qu. If a person has laid aside the scapular for a number of years, must he be invested ?

Resp. Not unless it has been laid aside through contempt, or with the intention of renouncing the confraternity. (S. C. Indulg. 27 Mai 1857.)

The Faculty of erecting the Stations of the Cross.

The Stations of the Cross are to be erected in this church soon. I beg your instruction, so that the Indulgences may be validly attached to them. On a former similar occasion I wrote to the Bishop for faculties, as required by the S. Congr. of Indulgences, 21 June, 1879, and to the Provincial of the Franciscans, as prescribed by the same Congr., 3 Aug., 1748. The former replied: "You already have by your general faculties that one of erecting the way of the cross in your parish."

The latter: "When you have the faculty from your bishop *singillatim* for the erection of the Stations of the Cross, everything is right, since the bishops here receive the Indult from the Holy See." . . . Having no other resource left, I blessed and placed the Stations according to the Ritual. "The Pastor" [1] thought—the erection invalid; and this seems certain from a response of the S. Congr. of Indulgences, 12 Sept., 1883; also from the fact that the S. Congr. de Prop. Fide, 21 Oct. 1883, obtained a *sanatio* from the Sovereign Pontiff in a similar case. . . . All this must have been known to the Bishop and Provincial at that time. It is useless to apply to them again, I suppose. What shall I do?

There seems to us no reason why the erection of the Via Crucis mentioned in this case should be held invalid. The formalities required were fully complied with, although not in the usual curial style. Our reverend correspondent wrote to his bishop, and received an answer which, reminding him of the faculty which he enjoyed, was certainly a *written concession to establish the Via Crucis* in his Church. This is all that is necessary for the *validity* of the erection. The formalities of entering the act in the archives of the episcopal chancery and of the parish church do not affect its validity, although they are required, lest there arise any doubt, later on, as to the canonical erection. It must be remembered that the institution of the Via Crucis belongs properly to the Order of Friar Minors, "privative quoad alios quoscumque," as the original statutes express it. The Superior General of the Franciscans is the only authorized person to delegate the faculty of erecting the Stations, except the Holy See. To avoid the danger of unauthorized erections and of contentions, those who receive this faculty are required to make a written deposition of the fact, which is to be preserved and shown, when necessary. This deposition can be made after the canonical erection, and there is no determined time within which this has to be done.[2] It can be supplied at any time, although the reasonableness of having it done at once is evident.

[1] Vol. II., page 223.

[2] Non esse determinatum tempus ad documentum erectionis conficiendum, sed ratio per se patet, ut quam citius hoc fiat, ne dubium in posterum oriatur circa prædictam canonicam erectionem. S. C. Indulg., 10 Feb., 1

We have, then, to distinguish between two kinds of formalities. The one of registering the act, and of which we have just spoken, is required, but does not affect the validity of the erection. The other, which is essential to this validity, in order that the proper Indulgences may be gained, makes it obligatory to obtain from the bishop or ordinary his sanction *in writing* for each particular case. The Decree of 1879, to which our correspondent makes reference, states that it is not enough to have this permission granted in general *for a certain number of churches* without special designation of the place.[1] Later on Leo XIII, at the request of the S. Propaganda, granted a *sanatio* in all cases where, by reason of any omission in the required formalities. the erection of the Stations may have been invalid.[2]

[1] Dub. "An consensus Ordinarii in scriptis requiratur sub pœna nullitatis in singulis casibus pro unaquaque Stationum erectione, vel sufficiat, ut sit generice præstitus pro erigendis stationibus in certo numero ecclesiarum vel oratoriorum sine specifica designatione loci?"

Resp. S. C. Indulg. 21 Jun. 1879: *Affirmative* ad primam partem; *Negative* ad secundam.

[2] "Rmus Archiepiscopus N. N. gaudet indulto apostolico erigendi viam crucis cum facultate communicandi ejusmodi licentiam etiam aliis sacerdotibus spirituali ipsius jurisdictioni subjectis. Tali indulto suffultus sacerdotibus archidiœcesis facultatem prædictam generali modo impertitus est, ita ut in singulis casibus recursum ad ipsum instituere haud debeant. Quum vero juxta superius exposita S. Congregationis Indulgentiarum decreta hujusmodi erectiones Viæ Crucis merito invalidæ censendæ sint, hinc humilis orator supplici genu postulat, quatenus S. V. in radice sanare dignetur omnes et singulas erectiones Viæ Crucis pro tempore in Archidiœcesi N. N. existentes quæ invalidæ fuerint vel ob causam in precibus enunciatam vel ob quamcumque aliam causam.—*Ex audientia SSi habita die* 21 *Oct.* 1883: SS. D. N. Leo Divina Providentia P.P. XIII, referente me infrascripto S. Congr. de Prop. Fide Secretario, petitam sanationem benigne concedere dignatus est; ad avertendum vero in posterum quodcumque dubium desuper legitima erectione Viæ Crucis curent Parochi vel Rectores ecclesiarum, in quibus modo exposito erecta fuit Via Crucis, petere in scriptis ab Ordinario requisitum consensum pro qualibet erectione singillatim.

Datum Romæ, etc.

D. Archiep. Tyren.

Secretarius.

Do these Documents render invalid the erection of the Stations of the Cross, where, as is customary with us, no special form is given except that one which contains the faculty "instituendi pium exercitium viæ crucis, cum applicatione omnium indulgentiarum et privilegiorum quæ Summi Pontifices. . . viæ crucis exercitium peragentibus impertiti sunt" and an appointment to a certain church or mission? We are slow to say so, and do not believe that we are to take the most rigorous interpretation of the above-mentioned documents.

According to Princivalli, who gives the decree of Aug. 3, 1748, referred to by our correspondent, the consent (consensus et licentia) of the ordinary is required for the valid erection of the via crucis. This consent is to be given in writing, so that it may be shown in case a controversy should arise concerning the validity of the erection, and the omission of this formality would render the erection itself null and void.[1] Commenting on this decree, Father Beringer, S. J., Consultor of the S. Congregation of Indulgences, says: It may happen that one or other of these requisite written instruments is plainly contained in another already in possession, so that an additional document seems superfluous.[2] This we would suppose to be the case with us, where the appointment to a definite church together with the express concession by faculty of erecting the Stations (usually done *scriptis*, which includes printed forms) plainly contains the necessary permission of the ordinary for a particular place. If, as is usually done, an "authentic" to testify to the actual erection and signed by the pastor (countersigned by the ordinary) is placed in the sacristy or other convenient place of the church, all doubt

[1] Ad vitandas controversias super validitate vel nullitate erectionis stationum viæ crucis ex defectu licentiæ episcopi ac ceterorum consensuum, constitutum fuit, sub pœna nullitatis erectionis ipsius, hujusmodi consensus et licentia in scriptis et non aliter expediri et quandocumque opus fuerit exhiberi debeant.—Muhlbauer: Decr. Authent. Suppl. iii., p. 657, a.

[2] Die Ablæsse, Ninth Edit., 1887, pag. 272, note.

seems to us removed.[1] And this appears to have been the impression of the bishop and the provincial to whom our correspondent applied. Whilst it is certainly advisable to make such applications in writing to the ordinary for each case, we believe that even if no answer were returned, the faculty which was granted in the first place together with the letter by which the priest's jurisdiction is limited to his appointed place, which is a *specifica designatio loci*, are documents which sufficiently insure validity of the erection. Outside of his own parish this would, of course, be insufficient. It may be objected: Why, then, did the Holy Father, through the Propaganda, give a *sanatio* in a case where the ordinary was said to have granted the faculty "generali modo, ita ut in singulis casibus (sacerdotes) recursum ad ipsum instituere haud debeant," which rendered the erection invalid?—We answer that in the case as proposed to the Holy See nothing is said to indicate that the faculty was granted by the bishop or archbishop to his priests *singillatim*, that is to say, for a *definite place*. Both the Holy See and the General of the Franciscans frequently grant the privilege of erecting the Way of the Cross for a certain number of times. A priest may thus receive the faculty of erecting twenty stations anywhere. In this case it is necessary for the valid erection, that the ordinary be applied to in each case separately, so as to mark the locality, since otherwise the primary object of the obligation to obtain the bishop's permission would be frustrated. The Dubium presented

[1] A suitable formula of this kind is:

Formula ad fidem faciendam
de erectione Viæ Crucis in Ecclesia
S. N. . . . .

Vigore facultatis mihi concessæ, ego, N. N., Viam Crucis cum adnexis indulgentiis erexi in Ecclesia (sacello) N. In quorum fidem testimonium hoc mea manu exaravi hac die . . . . mensis . . . . 1890.

N. N. . . . .
Rector.

N. N. . . . . .
Episcop. N.

with the request for a *sanatio* may easily have been understood as referring to such a case, and the S. Congregation rarely makes a distinction where the petitioner makes none. As a matter of fact, the subject had been discussed in the Roman Congregation, in July of the same year, precisely from this point of view, and a *sanatio* had been given in a Rescript dated July 31, 1883, and communicated to the General of the Franciscan Order.[1]

However, we do not wish to give any greater emphasis to our view than that which appears to be expressed by the fact that our bishops in general deem the transmission of the faculty to a regularly appointed priest, together with the registry of the act of erection in the respective church, sufficient formality for its validity. The letter of Leo XIII granting the *sanatio* in the case, says that, in order to avoid all doubt, rectors should ask the requisite consent of the ordinary "pro qualibet erectione singillatim." The easiest way to accomplish this would be to send the formula which is to certify to the erection (as given above in the note) to the ordinary, asking him to sign it; when returned, it can be framed and, as it is small, conveniently hung anywhere in the sacristy or the church. This should be done, for the sake of greater security, before the blessing of the stations takes place. Those who are anxious to fulfil the requisites in every detail will make a written request, keep a copy of this together with the ordinary's answer and the act of erection, place the whole in the parish archives, and, if the episcopal chancery keeps a similar record, another copy is sent there also, under the heading "Actus erectionis viæ crucis in ecclesia N. . . ."[2]

[1] Cf. Muhlb., Decr. Auth., l. c., p. 659, a.

[2] Circa erectionem viæ crucis, impetratis antea ab Apostolica Sede necessariis et opportunis facultatibus, omnia ac singula, quæ talem erectionem respiciunt, scripto fiant, tam nempe postulatio, quam erectionis ejusdem concessio, quarum instrumentum in codicibus seu in actis Episcopatus remaneat et testimonium saltem in codicibus parœciæ, seu loci ubi fuerint erectæ præfatæ Stationes, inseratur.—S. C. Indulg., 23 Sept., 1841.

ANALECTA.

RECENT DECREES OF THE S. CONGREGATION OF RITES.

Hodiernus Redactor Kalendarii pro Clero Diœceseos Monti Politiani, de consensu Rmi sui Episcopi, Sacræ Rituum Congregationi sequentia dubia enodare humillime proposuit, nimirum :

Dubium I.—Missa votiva SS. Cordis Jesu per Decretum diei 28 Junii 1889 pro Ecclesiis, in quibus de mane exercitia pietatis in honorem ejusdem Divini Cordis peraguntur, concessa, celebrari debet sine *Gloria*, sine *Credo*, et cum tribus Orationibus, an ritu quo celebrantur Missæ votivæ solemnes cum *Gloria* et *Credo* et unica Oratione ?

Dubium II.—In eodem Decreto statuitur quod secundæ Vesperæ die octavæ Corporis Christi sunt dicendæ *sine ulla commemoratione.* Cum non sint concordes redactores Kalendariorum in interpretandis his verbis, quæritur an per eadem verba commemoratio sequentis festi SS. Cordis excludatur, vel etiam commemoratio alicujus Sancti eo die ad modum simplicis redacti, ut accidit hoc anno pro S. Joanne a S. Facundo.

Dubium III.—Capitulum Vesperarum in festis Sanctorum septem Fundatorum Ordinis Servorum B. M. V et S. Catharinæ Fliscæ Adurnæ dicendumne est etiam ad Tertiam ?

Dubium IV.—Quando Episcopus Fer. V. in Cœna Domini bis procedit ab altari ad mensam pro sacris oleis conficiendis et ad altare regreditur, debetne uti baculo pastorali ?

Dubium V.—In benedicendo post Communionem extra

Missam ministratam, atque in absolvendis fidelibus in Pœnitentiæ Sacramento debetne Episcopus unam tantum vel tres Cruces efformare?

Dubium VI.—Si Sabbatho Sancto fiat Sacra Ordinatio, dicendæ suntne Litaniæ in Missali pro tali die assignatæ; vel illæ consuetæ quæ habentur in Pontificali Romano?

Dubium VII.—Diœceses, quibus concessum est officium B. M. V. titulo Boni Consilii, tenenturne assumere novum officium cum respondenti Missa prò eodem Festo a S. R. Congregatione anno 1884 probatum?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem infrascripti Secretarii, exquisitoque voto alterius ex Apostolicarum Cæremoniarum Magistris omnibus mature perpensis, ita propositis dubiis rescribendum censuit, nimirum:

Ad I. *Negative* ad primam partem; *affirmative* ad secundam.

Ad II. *Utraque commemoratio est omittenda.*

Ad III. *Affirmative.*

Ad IV. *Affirmative.*

Ad V. *Servandæ Rubricæ* Ritualis Romani.

Ad VI. Dicendæ sunt in casu Litaniæ in Missali assignatæ, additis quæ Episcopus proferre debet super Ordinandos post V. *omnibus fidelibus defunctis*, etc.

Ad VII. *Affirmative.*

Atque ita rescripsit, declaravit et servari mandavit die 20 Maji 1890.

† Caj: Card. ALOISI MASELLA S. R. C. Præf.
VINC. NUSSI Secretarius.

BOOK REVIEW.

CATHOLIC MANUALS OF PHILOSOPHY. General Metaphysics by John Rickaby. Benziger Bros. 1890. p. lix-398.

In reviewing Fr. Rickaby's "First Principles of Knowledge" we noted as a point in its favor its utility as a side book in our seminary

classes of Philosophy. More intimate acquaintance with the four volumes of the Stonyhurst series thus far published convinces us that they might to advantage supplant in large measure our pre ent Latin texts. Not that we would advocate teaching Seminarians scholastic philosophy in English, but that, if the authors of these manuals would issue corresponding Latin compendia, or failing this, if professors of philosophy constructed such digests and placed them, conjointly with these English manuals, in the hands of their pupils, it would turn to the profit of our seminary courses. In illustration of this suggestion let us take Fr. Rickaby's chapter on our knowledge of essences in the volume before us. But first note the treatment of the same subject in one of our fullest and best Latin text books. In the latter we find a brief paragraph given to the statement of Locke's nominalistic theory; a second brief paragraph to the defining of the question—conceding that our knowledge extends to comparatively few essences; that it is abstractive, not intuitive; imperfect, not comprehensive. Within half a page it is shown that common sense testifies to our knowledge of some *natural essences*, as does also the fact admitted by nominalists that we know the *real properties* of some things (for from this it follows that we know the *essential composite* or *root* of such properties); whilst the negation of such knowledge rests on the already refuted false nominalism in regard to universal ideas. The objections against the proposition are dismissed with a page. Whilst the salient principles bearing on this most important question are, of course, traced within the narrow compass indicated, it is plain that no small work is thrown on teacher and pupil, especially in drawing out the living character of the subject in the thought of to-day. Now run over Fr. Ricaby's discussion of the same theme. He approaches the subject from the proper—the subjective direction. To the word *essence* is given a broad meaning, as *ens essential*, and a narrower meaning, as the *constitutive principle* of things. As to the former sense, "it is asserted to be the prerogative of intellect proper, that it knows all its objects under the aspect of *essences*, and that this its power is made a strongly distinguishing mark between the perception which is characteristically human and mere animal perception" (p. 60). This is confirmed by citations from such anti-scholastics as Lewes and Romanes.

Against our claim for a knowledge of *essences* in the second sense "attacks may be divided into three possible degrees. (1) The fact of

essence may be granted, but all further knowledge of it denied; (2) the fact may be declared doubtful; (3) the so-called fact may be pronounced a fiction of the mind" (p. 62). Locke leads in the first line, his position being clearly set forth by Reid (p. 63). Locke explicitly states that "the essences of things are nothing else but our abstract ideas" (p. 64). Thus Locke grants that things have essences, "real essences;" what he denies is that we can know anything more than the "*nominal essences*," which, Hamilton says, is only another phrase for "*logical essences*," or "the abstract notions worked out by general terms" (ibid.). "The two other positions are dealt with together, as the step from agnosticism to positive denial is only one of audacity in making assertions" (ibid.). Neill is here seen in the van. According to him "an essential property is one which is part or the very definition of the word which stands as subject in a sentence; and such essence is *verbal*, not *real*. As for any *real essential motive* in physical things, we know of none such, and in any case, the relativity of all knowledge would be a bar to the knowledge of essences, such as the schoolmen assert. Here we have a doctrine common in the school of Hume . . . Lewes likens the Aristotelian essences to the pure space which is supposed to be the background of all things; essences are empty as space, mere negations of all attributes or phenomena; indeed, there can be no absolute thing in itself, for "nothing exists in and for itself," and the universe known to us is a system of correlated events" (p. 67). Though "to fight out this battle to the end belongs to special metaphysics—to cosmology, which treats of bodies, and to psychology, which lays down what is meant by a spiritual substance" (p. 69), yet "in the rough the form of expression can hardly be rejected that *science* seeks to arrive at the *very nature* of things, and that it has some measure of success in the enterprise" (p. 70). This Fr. Rickaby amply proves by a number of citations from Neill, wherein the latter acute writer evidently contradicts his dicta regarding our knowledge of mere *nominal essences*. Mr. Bain is seen helping the good work of his colleague thus: "If we understood more thoroughly the ultimate arrangement of the atoms of bodies, we might not improbably find that one *fundamental* property was the *foundation*—a *real essence*, of which the characters are but the *propria*" (p. 73). Too much emphasis cannot be laid "on the fact that scepticism in the school of Hume about essences does not begin at this point; it rests on utterly false theories about man's power of

knowledge, which is logically reduced to a mere chemistry of ideas, or of the phenomenal states of self-consciousness. Of course, on these shifting and unsubstantial grounds we can build no knowledge of essences" (ibid.).

But leaving to Psychology the determining of the true theory of knowledge, we may do "something to rehabilitate the much discredited teaching of the Schoolmen by starting from less disputed points. At least in the abstract sciences, notably in mathematics, it is maintainable that we can devise *essential* definitions, which stand good amid accidental variations, and have a most unmistakably real significance. Reid confesses as much when he says, "that from the *essence* of a triangle we may be able to deduce its properties. We can determine exactly what *constitutes* the precise *nature* of certain figures, distinguishes them *specifically* from other figures, and enables us to infer their necessary attributes" (p. 68). But we may go to the concrete sciences, to which our opponents cling so closely, for weightier testimony. "Our contention is that, when together, these books[1] do show some knowledge, more or less adequate, about *essences;* that they do furnish replies, more or less final, to the question, *what is* this, that, and the other. For example, the laws of motion, of gravitation, and of combination by definite proportions; the reduction of light and sound to vibratory movements calculable mathematically; the doctrine of the transformation of energy; the assertion of comparatively few chemical elements—all these are approximatives to knowledge of essences; they are the knowledge of what, with a certain looseness of expression, may well be called secondary or derivative essences. Again, to know matter as substance and efficient cause is to know it under an *essential* aspect, though a highly generalized one. Even the classificatory sciences, such as botany and zoology, which in part at least are concerned with matter, so far as they go on a natural system," point in the direction of *essences.* In short, the very admission that there is such a thing as physical science, and that science is *cognitio rerum per causas*—a knowledge of things according to the *rationale* of them—is tantamount to saying, that some manner of acquaintance with *essences* is possible; that the world does present its objects ranged according to at least a certain number of different kinds, and that we can do something to mark off one kind from another. Whatever be the extent of the 'law of continuity,' at least it

[1] Sciences— Cosmology and Special Physical Sciences.

does not abolish every single specific difference in the world; and there are other differences that have established a character which is, if not in the fullest sense specific, at least is secondarily and practically specific: for example, the difference between 'chalk and cheese.' To this moderate extent the schoolmen are justified in their pretensions to have knowledge of *essences*" (p. 79). Nor do we limit our knowledge to the *essences* of *material* things, but lay claim to prove the conclusions of psychology regarding the *essence* of *spirit:* for instance, that "spirit is an extended substance acting by means of intelligence and will, especially of intelligence, which shows itself to be perfectly self-reflective, and of will, which shows itself to be free" (p. 81).

Other passages might be chosen to indicate the desirability of making this Manual the basis of a Latin Compendium, for instance, the kindred chapter on the nature and reality of substance (pp. 245–267); the latter half of the chapter on the Finite and Infinite, treating of the application of these notions to the sum total of possibilities (pp. 204–220); the discussion on the Beautiful, an idea which is not sufficiently described in our Latin texts. But our hasty sketch, inadequately though it represents the original, must suffice to bear out our suggestion, hinting as it may at a striking merit of the Manual—the bringing of the old philosophy into the camps of the new, overthrowing what in the latter it finds antagonistic, and pressing into good service the forces of truth wherever it meets them. What we have said may also suggest another purpose which the book is well fitted to answer—the introducing of non-Catholic readers of fair intelligence to the foundations of the Church's philosophy—to the basis alike of all her philosophy, as well as to the natural elements of support in her scientific theology. To such readers it will show that the scholastic metaphysics—with the proper qualifications, which Fr. Rickaby fails not to note, stand firm in the light of modern thought, nay, strengthen on being confronted with whatever is true in the latter.

We have one fault to find with the book—if fault it be—viz., its *brevity*. The work might have been somewhat improved by enlargement. The queen of natural science may well be jealous that she has received considerably less domain than her helpmate, logic. Had an additional hundred pages been added to this Manual, making it thus equal to the size of the Logic, space would have been allowed, e. g., for Simple and Compound Being, for the Category of Quality, etc.; and less risk

would have been run of sacrificing clearness to brevity. Though the style is clear, yet greater compass would have made it easier reading, a feature desirable in these days even in Metaphysics.

F. P. S.

VEN. P. LUDOVICI DE PONTE S. J. MEDITATIONES DE PRÆCIPUIS FIDEI NOSTRÆ MYSTERIIS, de Hispanico in Latinum translatæ a Melchiore Trevinnio, S. J. De Novo editæ cura Augustini Lehmkuhl, S. J. Part. V. et VI.—Friburgi Brisg. Sumpt. Herder. 1890. (St. Louis: B. Herder.)

In noticing these two volumes, which complete the excellent new edition of De Ponte's Meditations by Fr. Lehmkuhl, we wish merely to emphasize what we said in our review of the first part of this work. It is related of more than one great theologian, that they made their morning meditations from some text in the Summa of St. Thomas. This method may sanctify some, yet for the majority there is in it always danger of giving the intellect more food than the heart. The learned Jesuit of Vallisolet comes, however, very near to the theological student's ideal. The solid character of his matter reminds you everywhere of the Angel of the Schools, and, in fact, aside of the Holy Scriptures, upon which these meditations are, so to say, planned and built, we hardly meet any other authorities to which he refers but St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, and St. Bernard. These occur constantly, and they point to the sound reasoning and the *sincera doctrina* contained in the volumes. That the author should found his reflections on the subject of creation (Vol. VI., Med. xviii., pag. 175) upon the old and nearly obsolete view of the hexæmeron creation, or that he should grossly differ from modern astronomers in his calculation of the size of the sun relative to our earth (Vol. VI., Med. xxii., pag. 213), does not in the least diminish the usefulness of these meditations, the test of whose value lies in their aptness to concentrate the mind upon the eternal truths which underlie external facts.

The fifth volume has an introduction on union with God, or rather what is called the unitive way in the spiritual life. Some of the meditations in this and the last volumes are beautiful and withal profound studies of the divine mysteries and those of the Church. Such, for example, are the chapters on the divine essence, on the unity and trinity of God, on the precept of charity, which throws clear light on the action of grace, on the essential glory of the soul and body and of our senses after death,

on the gifts of the Holy Ghost, etc. They are without exception practical, and the author has taken occasion to give explanations here and there of how devotions may be utilized for the conversion and sanctification of souls. The chapter on the different methods of reciting the Rosary (Vol. V., pag. 354) is an example of this.

Excellent as is this work, which has stood the test of three hundred years, and apparently needed no change to be ever appreciated by succeeding generations of learned and devout souls, Father Lehmkuhl's merit is not confined to having issued a faultless edition. He adds with modest grace, under the title of Appendix, twelve meditations, "brevia meditationis puncta," of favorite Saints, whose lives present special attractions to those who seek perfection particularly in religion or in the priesthood. There is also an Appendix which distributes the meditations, so that they may be conveniently carried out through the year without having to follow the order of the author, who groups his subjects according to their nature.—Qui potest capere, capiat.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The mention of Books under this head does not preclude further notice of them in subsequent numbers.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS juxta doctrinam S. Alphonsi Mariæ de Ligorio, Doctoris Ecclesiæ. Auctore Jos. Ærtnys, C.SS.R. Editio altera aucta et recognita. Tom. I. et II.—Paderbornæ: Ferdinand Schœningh. 1890.

SUPPLEMENTUM ad Tractatum de VII. Decalogi præcepto secundum Jus Civile Gallicum, Auctore Jos. Aertnys, C.SS.R.—Paderbornæ: Ferdinand Schœningh. 1890.

THE SANITARY CONDITIONS AND NECESSITIES OF SCHOOL-HOUSES AND SCHOOL-LIFE. By D. F. Lincoln, M. D., Boston, Mass.—American Public Health Association. Rochester, N. Y.

NICOLAI NILLES E. SOC. JESU COMMENTARIA IN CONCILIUM PLENARIUM BALTIMORENSE TERTIUM EX PRÆLECTIONIBUS ACADEMICIS EXCERPTA. Pars I. Acta Concilii. Pars II. Decreta Concilii. Editio domestica, Privatis auditorum usibus accommodata.—Œniponte. Ex offic. F. Rauch (C. Pustet) 1888-1890.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

NICOLAI NILLES, S. J.,

COMMENTARIA IN CONCILIUM

PLENARIUM BALTIMORENSE TERTIUM,

EX PRÆLECTIONIBUS ACADEMICIS AD USUS AUDITORUM

PERMISSU PRAESIDUM EDITA.

8vo. Half mor. $4 00

NICOLAI NILLES, S. J.,

DE VITA ET HONESTATE CLERICORUM

DISPUTATIUNCULA

EX COMMENTARIIS IN CONCIL. PLEN. BALTIMOR. III.

Privatis Auditorum Usibus Extracta.

8vo. Paper, bound ..... 15c.

JOSEPH FESSLER,

QUONDAM EPISCOPI S. HYPPOLYTI

INSTITUTIONES PATROLOGIAE

Quas Denuo Recensuit, Auxit, Edidit,

BERNARDUS JUNGMANN.

Tom. I. 8vo. ..... Half mor. $2.25

ANTONII BALLERINI, S. J.,

OPUS THEOLOGICUM MORALE

IN BUSEMBAUM MEDULLAM

Absolvit et Edidit

DOMINICUS PALMIERI, S. J.

Tom. I–II. 8vo ..... Half mor. $5.70

FIVE-MINUTE SERMONS

FOR THE SUNDAYS THROUGHOUT THE YEAR,

BY

W. H. ANDERDON, S. J.,

Part I. From Trinity Sunday to the 13th Sunday after Pentecost.

Paper ..... net, 20c.

PLAIN SERMONS

On the Fundamental Truths of The Catholic Church,

BY THE

REV. R. D. BROWNE.

Cloth, net $1.60

SERMONS, 1877–1887,

BY THE

REV. ARTHUR RYAN, President of St. Patrick's College, Thurles.

Cloth, net $2.00

FR. PUSTET & CO.